

343

THE REFORMED QUARTERLY REVIEW

NO. 1.—JANUARY, 1896.

I.

CHARACTERISTICS OF HEBREW POETRY.*

BY REV. F. A. GAST, D.D.

MANY readers of the Bible lose an incalculable amount of pure, refined enjoyment by failing, through inattention, to discern the poetic element in the Old Testament Scriptures. They have heard the Psalms read since their earliest childhood, when as yet their minds could neither comprehend their meaning nor perceive their beauty; they have grown so accustomed to the familiar sound that, whatever religious feelings may be awakened in them, no more æsthetic emotion is inspired in the majority of readers than by the algebraic formula: $(x+y)^2=x^2+2xy+y^2$. Indeed, no inconsiderable effort is needed to rouse the soul in later years to a due appreciation of the sweetness and tenderness of their spiritual beauty. Yet that liberal education cannot be regarded as complete, which while it points out the splendors, and fosters a taste for the enjoyment, of the poetic creations of Greece, Rome and modern Europe, suffers a veil to

* Somewhat altered in form from an Address delivered before the students of the College and Seminary at the opening of the institutions at Lancaster, September 12, 1895.

hide from the view of the cultivated mind that other, and, in some regards, higher realm of poetry bequeathed to the world by the psalmists and prophets and wise men of Israel. True, this poetry is of a different order, but of no less intrinsic excellence; and no one who lays claim to literary culture should be unacquainted with the productions of the Hebrew imagination.

It will surprise many, perhaps, to learn that well nigh one-half of the Old Testament is poetry. This fact is not at once apparent to the reader of the Authorized Version, which unhappily prints the poetry uniformly with the prose, in utter disregard of the laws of Hebrew versification. For the poetry of the Old Testament is poetic, not simply in virtue of its thought and sentiment and diction, but also in its outward form, which, widely different as it is from the forms of classic and modern poetry, is yet rhythmical in its movement and artificial in its structure. When arranged in lines, as it is by the Revised Version in the Poetical Books and in numerous songs scattered throughout the Historical and Prophetical Books, the form, as soon as it is explained, is easily perceived by any intelligent mind, and lends an added beauty to the poetic thought.

The poetry of the Old Testament is not limited to the books of Job, Psalms, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Canticles and Lamentations. Throughout the pages of the historians we meet with gems of song, beginning with the Sword-Song of Lamech (Gen. iv. 23, 24), which, proud, fierce, defiant, revengeful in spirit, has, though one of the oldest specimens of lyric poetry, all the musical flow, the striking alliteration and the exact correspondence of parallel members which characterize the best productions of Israel's bards.

" Adah and Zillah ! hear my voice,
Ye wives of Lamech ! give ear to my speech ;
For I slay a man for wounding me,
Even a youth for inflicting a stripe.
Lo ! Cain is avenged seven-fold,
But Lamech seventy and seven-fold."

At every step along the course of the history our ears are

greeted with poetic strains. Now it is a mere fragment we catch, like that quoted in Josh. x. 12, 13, from the Book of Jasher :

"Sun, stand thou still upon Gibeon,
And thou, moon, in the valley of Ajalon.
And the sun stood still, and the moon stayed,
Till the nation was avenged on its enemies."

Again it is a long, highly-finished and complete ode, like that crowning glory of the lyric poetry of early Israel, the almost unrivalled Song of Deborah (Jud. v.).

At one time we listen to the Blessing of the Dying Jacob on his Sons (Gen. xlix.), or of Moses, the man of God, on the Tribes (Deut. xxxiii.); at another we exult with the victors in some song of triumph, like that sung by Moses and Miriam when the rescued host stood safe on the shore of the Red Sea (Ex. xv.); at still another, we are moved by some tender, pathetic dirge; like that of David on the death of Saul and Jonathan (2 Sam. i.) :

"Thy glory, O Israel, is slain upon thy heights.

(CHORUS).—*How are the heroes fallen !*

Tell it not in Gath,
Publish it not in the streets of Askelon ;
Lest the daughters of the Philistines rejoice—
Lest the daughters of the uncircumcised triumph.

Ye mountains of Gilboa, no dew nor rains
Come upon you, and ye fields of offerings ;
For there the shield of the hero is polluted,
The shield of Saul not anointed with oil.

From the blood of the slain,
From the fat of the heroes,
The bow of Jonathan turned not back,
And the sword of Saul returned not empty.

Saul and Jonathan, lovely and pleasant in their lives,
And in their death they are not divided.
Swifter than eagles,
Stronger than lions.

Ye daughters of Israel, weep over Saul,
 Who clothed you in purple with delight,
 Who put ornaments of gold
 Upon your apparel.

(CHORUS).—*How are the heroes fallen in the midst of battle !
 O Jonathan, slain upon thy heights !*

I am distressed for thee, my brother Jonathan,
 Very pleasant hast thou been unto me :
 Thy love to me was wonderful,
 Passing the love of women.

(CHORUS).—*How are the heroes fallen
 And the weapons of war perished !*"

And so, too, the Prophetical Books are enriched by some of the noblest lyrics. What an incomparable taunt-song is that on the King of Babylon (Isa. xiv. 4-23) ! And where will you find an ode surpassing in sublimity the ode of Habakkuk (Hab. iii) ? Indeed, the prophets themselves are true poets, blending truth and beauty in sweetest harmony. Whenever they rise to the loftiest themes, their sentiment becomes highly poetic, their diction is elevated far above prose, and their utterance assumes a rhythmical form. Take, as a specimen, the first two verses of Isaiah :

"Hear, O heavens, and give ear, O earth,
 For Jehovah hath spoken :
 'I have nourished and brought up children,
 And they have rebelled against me.

The ox knoweth his owner,
 And the ass his master's crib :
 Israel doth not know,
 My people doth not consider.'"

Picture to yourselves the scenes which these words introduce. It is a grand assize, at which Israel is the defendant, Jehovah the plaintiff and judge. We hear the accusation : "I have nourished and brought up children, and they have rebelled against me." What boundless astonishment finds utterance in these words ! Children, not dumb beasts ; children reared to

manhood and elevated to honor, yet rebelling against their Father, and such a Father, the God of heaven and earth, who made them in His image and bestowed on them such loving care! The prophet is dumfounded in the presence of such insensate ingratitude, such base guilt. He can express his deep abhorrence only by contrasting Israel with the irrational brutes. "The ox knoweth his owner, and the ass his master's crib. Israel doth not know, my people doth not consider." Do you wonder that He bursts forth in holy indignation: "O sinful nation! people laden with iniquity! seed of evil-doers! children that do corruptly! they have forsaken Jehovah, they have reviled the Holy One of Israel, they have gone away backward." Are you surprised that He summons the whole universe to witness the enormity of Israel's guilt? "Hear, O heavens, and give ear, O earth." How many splendid images within the compass of these two verses! Mark the majestic apostrophe to heaven and earth, as if they were living persons capable of testifying against the prophet's people. And what a magnificent sweep of the imagination from heaven to earth—a sweep as broad as the universe. Add to this the beauty of the parallelism, effected now by the contrast of "heaven" and "earth," of ungrateful "Israel," and the irrational but still responsive "ox" and "ass;" now by different, but equivalent, terms, such as "hear" and "give ear," "owner" and "master," "Israel" and "my people," "know" and "consider;" and then tell me whether this is not poetry, and poetry of a very high order?

Seeing that poetry constitutes so large a part of the Old Testament, let us endeavor to characterize its distinctive features, that we may estimate its true worth. It is futile to attempt, as has so often been done, to institute a comparison between the poetry of the Hebrews and that of other non-Semitic peoples, like the Greeks and the Romans, the English and the Germans. They are too dissimilar to admit of being brought into analogy. Hebrew poetry has a glory of its own, and in its own order it needs fear no rival. Greek poetry, too, is matchless in its kind. But the glory of the Hebrew is one,

and the glory of the Greek is another. They may be contrasted; they can never, without absurdity, be compared. So that if we would form a correct estimate of the poetic element in the Old Testament, we must at once dismiss from our minds the canons of literary criticism derived from the study of classic and modern poetry. Measured by these, the poetry of the Bible has seemed to many—and not unjustly—as rude, almost barbarous and without art, and destitute of beauty. But when a different standard is applied, the standard of spiritual truth and life, then it bursts upon our vision as a new and glorious creation, incomparable in its simplicity and naturalness, its universal human interest and its divine heights and depths. Its very artlessness is an element of its perfection, whether we look to the form it assumes, the thought and sentiment it enshrines, or the pure spirit it everywhere breathes.

Turning aside for the time from the richly varied contents of Hebrew poetry, and fixing the attention, first of all, on what is distinctive of its form, no attentive eye can fail to observe that, like the Semitic mind which gave it birth, it is essentially and intensely subjective in its character. The Hebrew poet sings as no other does, at least to the same extent, out of the depths of his own heart. His inner experience in its manifold phases of faith and hope, of love and adoration, of joy and sorrow, of fear and courage, furnishes his noblest themes. The surrounding world, whether of nature or of man, has no interest for him, save as it touches his own life and mirrors the feelings of his own soul. His poetry may thus seem to flow in a narrow stream; but on that very account it is all the more enthusiastic and inspiring.

In this preponderant subjectivity we find a satisfactory explanation of the fact that, of the three possible species of poetry—the epic, the drama and the lyric—the Hebrews have only the lyric. When we remember that the true lyric, as seen in the poetry of India, Greece and Germany, rests on a mythological basis, such as is furnished by popular belief and popular legend, we might be tempted to think, indeed, that the absence of the

Hebrew epic is due to the unmythological and monotheistic nature of the religion of Israel. But when we notice that the Arabs, before the age of Islam, produced only the lyric—that not until they came into contact with the Persians did they acquire an interest in, and ability to write narrative poetry, and that of all the Semitic peoples in ancient times the Assyrians alone possessed the epic, and that not as a native creation, but as a loan from their non-Semitic predecessors in the valley of the Euphrates, *—we feel constrained to account for this one-sided development of poetry, from which both the epic and the drama are excluded, by some general cause operative in the Semitic mind at large. And that cause, as I have already said, is the intense subjectivity of the Semite.

Both the epic and the drama demand that the individuality of the poet should vanish behind the scenes he describes, seeing through another's eyes, thinking through another's brain, and speaking through another's mouth. This is possible to the Aryan, with his self-forgetting interest in the external world; it is not possible to the Semite, who, like the child, views the world in the light of the feelings swaying him at the moment.

It has been claimed, indeed, that the Book of Job is an epic and the Canticles a drama. But, while the former has an underlying basis in history, to be gathered mainly from the prologue and the epilogue, the poem itself lacks an element essential to the epic—the portrayal of human deeds and destinies—and finds in the events that so deeply touch the life of Job only an occasion for discussing, from various points of view, the mysterious dealings of God with man. And as to the Canticles, while it is true that the poem has the shifting scenes, the *dramatis personæ*, the dialogues and the monologues, and even the chorus, that characterize the ancient drama, it is equally true that it is wanting in that action which the name "drama" implies. The most that can be said is that, while the Book of Job contains certain epic elements, and the Canti-

*That is, if the Sumerian theory is true, though it must be confessed that Halevy, Delitzsch and others have shown it to be very doubtful.

cles displays some of the features of the drama, they are essentially lyrical, inasmuch as they are the subjective expression of poetic thought and emotion, and not an objective representation of external action and life.

The lyric, then, is the form natural to the Hebrew poet in the outgoings of his soul. Only the meaning of the term "lyric" must not be confined within too narrow limits. Strictly speaking, it denotes a poem suitable to be sung. Such is the character of the Lamentations and most of the Psalms. But the word is used also in a more general sense to comprehend any poem which gives immediate expression, in rhythmical movement and grand style, to the inner life and personal experience of the poet. In this broader meaning the lyric is didactic, moving in the realm of thought rather than of feeling, and intended to influence primarily the intellectual nature, and only through this, the emotional. Of such character are the Proverbs and Ecclesiastes. But, though confined to one species—the lyric—and so, seemingly, hampered in the free expression of thought and sentiment, Hebrew poetry is yet as varied as the wondrous play of the emotions of the poet in his contemplation of God, nature and his own soul. It is subjective, and yet in a sense universal, for the Hebrew poet's heart is swayed by the grandest and profoundest movements of life in the universe.

Another characteristic is its simplicity of form. The Hebrew poet was no artist in the sense the Greek poet was, laboring at the expression of his thought, polishing and refining it, that he might delight the imagination of his hearers and awaken their admiration by a display of his skill. Israel's psalmists and prophets were too earnest for this. Their souls were burdened with a message to the world, and they were intent only on its delivery. They heeded little the letter, if they could but communicate the spirit. Their poetry was the poetry of sense, rather than of sound. It was not altogether wanting in art, but the art, unfettered by conventional rules, was the free, spontaneous expression of the soul.

How different, in this regard, is Greek and Latin poetry,

with its uniform and mechanical system of versification! Here everything is rigidly prescribed—the number of feet in a verse, the number of syllables in a foot, the quantity of the syllables and the order of their arrangement. And this holds good, too, of modern poetry, except that here the character of the foot is determined by the accent, rather than by the quantity of the syllables. Besides, most modern poetry is rendered still more mechanical in form than the classic by its employment of rhyme—of lines ending in similarly sounding words. Now all this is very beautiful to the ear, and produces the effect of a well-constructed melody in music. But what fetters it binds on the poet's soul! If he is to pour forth the thoughts and feelings of his heart, he must pour them into a rigidly fixed, unyielding mould. He is "cabined, cribbed, confined." The sound, absolutely predetermined, controls the expression of the sense.

The Hebrew poet enjoys a remarkable freedom from all such cramping mechanical rules. His language is rich in the means of producing rhymes, yet he makes no systematic use of the principle so characteristic of modern poetry, even the Hebrew poetry of the modern Jews. Rhyme is occasionally found, but as it seldom extends beyond a couplet or a triplet, and never throughout a complete poem, it is, we may believe, generally unintentional. Not unfrequently assonance is employed, and with fine effect, and more rarely alliteration; but neither rhyme, assonance nor alliteration has become a law of Hebrew poetry.

There have been many attempts, from the time of Philo and Josephus to the present day, to find in Hebrew poetry a system of metres, such as we find in all Greek and Latin poetry. But if we retain the traditional punctuation and accentuation of the Hebrew text, we can discern no trace of a regular recurrence of similar feet disposed in various rhythms. The feature which, both to eye and ear, is most distinctive of the form of the Hebrew poetry is its parallelism of members, which Herder aptly compares to the dance with its rhythmic movements, and

to the choral song of the Greeks, with its strophe and antistrophe. Its inmost soul is an easily apprehended symmetry, a simplicity in equality. It displays a richly-varied rhythm, which, however, is not so much a rhythm of sound as of thought and feeling. The poetry of the Hebrews is sententious; it gives full utterance to a leading idea, most frequently in a couplet, though often, also, in a triplet, of which the first member states the theme, while the second—or, in the triplet, the second and third—echoes the theme, repeating, supplementing, contrasting, but always in different words, thus greatly heightening the similarity or the contrast.

An example or two will afford a clearer idea of the nature of this parallelism than the fullest and most accurate description. Take the doublet couplet Ps. xxi. 1, 2:

"Jehovah, in Thy strength the king doth rejoice,
And in Thy salvation how greatly doth he exult.
The desire of his heart Thou hast granted unto him,
And the request of his lips Thou hast not denied."

You will observe that each couplet expresses a single thought repeated in the two lines, but in varied language, and in such a way that the second line heightens the thought, whose keynote is sounded in the first. Moreover, the lines of each couplet exactly correspond in construction and form of expression. "Jehovah, in Thy strength the king doth rejoice," conveys the same idea as, "in Thy salvation how greatly doth he exult," only that here it is intensified and altered in expression. The two members run strictly parallel, "in Thy strength" corresponding to "in Thy salvation," and "the king doth rejoice" to "how greatly doth he exult." So, too, in the second couplet, the first line "The desire of his heart Thou hast granted unto him" affirms positively what the second line, "the request of his lips Thou has not denied," asserts negatively. And mark how they balance each other, term set over against term, "the desire" and "the request," "of his heart" and "of his lips," "Thou hast granted" and "Thou hast not denied."

Again, take an example of a triplet :

"Blessed is the man who walketh not in the counsel of the ungodly,
Nor standeth in the way of sinners,
Nor sitteth in the assembly of mockers."—(Ps. 1: 1).

The poet here describes the righteous man negatively, showing what he does not do. No reader can fail to notice the beauty of the climax. It is dangerous to walk in the counsel of the ungodly, but more dangerous to stand in the way of sinners, and still more dangerous to sit in the assembly of mockers. Note, too, the threefold correspondence and the variety of the terms employed: "walk," "stand," "sit;" "counsel," "way," "assembly;" "ungodly," "sinners," "scorners."

Hebrew poetry, in virtue of this simplicity and elasticity, admits of being rendered into any language without appreciable loss of either form or substance. A translation of the *Iliad* of Homer or the *Odes* of Horace could not be distinguished from simple prose, except by an occasional hyperbolic expression, or by some striking ornamental epithet. Their charm vanishes, if they are not fully reproduced in a skillfully elaborated metrical form, which always involves an alteration, to a greater or less extent, of the original thought. Hebrew poetry, on the other hand, owes little to the rhythm of sound, but everything to the pulsation of thought and feeling. Its beauty and sublimity, its tenderness and pathos can be veiled by no translation, however prosaic, if only such translation be faithful and true. And this can be said of no other poetry the world has ever produced.

There is another characteristic of form to which I must briefly refer. All poetry has its peculiar diction, differing in elegance and elevation from that of common, every-day prose. The diction of Hebrew poetry is sensuous and pictorial in a much higher degree than that of our western, even our romantic, poetry.

Something of this is due to the nature of the Hebrew language, which is the language of poetry, rather than that of abstract thought and philosophical speculation. Its word-roots

are in large part onomato-poetic, or at least their original sense-conception is but slightly veiled. Its noun and adjective spring directly from the verb, whose life and movement they retain. The language has developed comparatively few abstracts; it presents everything in concrete form. There is a wealth of synonyms, each of which denotes an object or event under a distinct aspect. It often gathers up such a fulness of meaning within the compass of a single word that it can be rendered in English only by a phrase of three, four, or even more words. Especially do its so-called tenses communicate life to a painted scene. Unlike the tenses of the Aryan languages, they do not define the date of an action, but rather express its mode, as completed or unfinished. The poet, accordingly, is ever shifting his point of view, now standing before the action, and seeing it in its incipency or its orderly progress, now standing behind it, and contemplating it as a completed whole. All is life, activity, motion, which it is impossible to reproduce in any other language.

But here we are concerned with Hebrew poetry only so far as it can be translated into English without marring the beauty of its form or diminishing from the grandeur of its ideas. Oriental poetry in general, and Hebrew poetry in particular, is proverbially distinguished for its great wealth of imagery. Palestine, small as it is in extent, presented in the days of its glory a larger variety of geographical features, physical aspects, climatic changes, natural productions and social conditions, than could be seen elsewhere in an area ten times as great. No poet was ever so favorably situated in this respect as the Hebrew poet. Around, above, beneath lay scattered the materials with which he wrought, and, putting heaven and earth under contribution to his art, he heaped image on image, often in seemingly reckless extravagance, yet always with the effect of exquisite beauty. The poets of Greece and Rome, reared amid the settled life of cities and devoted to the cultivation of literature and art, lived less near to the beating heart of nature than the Hebrew poet, who views all her varied aspects as if

they mirrored the thoughts of his mind and the emotions of his soul. His similes are unsurpassed in any literature for aptness and beauty; as when he compares the sun to a bridegroom coming out of his chamber and rejoicing like a hero to run a race; or the godly man to a tree planted by rivulets of water, that brings forth his fruit in his season, and whose leaf does not wither. His metaphors especially are striking and bold. Heaven is God's throne, and earth His footstool; the stars are His military host, fighting against Sisera; the storm-cloud is His chariot, the thunder His voice, the lightnings His swift, piercing arrows. Where can you match Job's figure, "the eyelashes of the dawn," as imaging the first rays of the rising day, just opening, as it were, its eyes on the world? Everywhere the Hebrew poet sets the image for the object he would paint. He does not present to us a dead universe, in which there is neither mind nor spirit, where brute force and blind necessity alone rule. His imagination pictures the world as full of life and soul. He endues inanimate objects with thought, emotion and speech. He gives to abstract ideas and qualities concrete form. To his imagination the world thrills with conscious life and activity; nothing is dead or stagnant.

All that I have thus far said will receive ample illustration in the selections I shall make when considering, as I now proceed to do, the subject-matter of Hebrew poetry.

Hebrew poetry, as it has been transmitted to us in the Old Testament, is broadly distinguished from the poetry of other nations by the fact that it is almost exclusively of a religious character. Among the poetical books, the Song of Solomon forms the sole exception. Only the most arbitrary allegorical interpretation can impress on it a religious meaning. Yet it holds a worthy place in the Sacred Canon; for, in a series of dialogues and monologues, it portrays the ideal of pure human love as kindled by God in the heart of young man and maiden. It is a love-song indeed; but how different in sentiment and tone from the amatory strains of an Ovid or Catullus! Where will you find in them—where in all heathen literature—a truer,

chaster description of love than in the prayer of Shulamith to her lover (viii. 6. 7):

"Set me as a signet upon thy heart,
As a signet upon thine arm.
For strong as death is love,
Hard as Sheol is jealousy:
Its flashes are flashes of fire—
A flame kindled by Jehovah.
Many waters cannot quench love,
Neither can rivers wash it away.
If a man were to give all the wealth of his house for love,
He would be utterly condemned."

Setting aside the Canticles, and a few popular and national songs in which the religious spirit is hardly felt, we may rightly say that Hebrew poetry has but one theme, than which, however, there can be none grander, loftier or more inspiring. It is the interpreter at once of God, as He manifests Himself in the works of nature and the events of history, and of the human heart as it responds to Him in penitence, gratitude and praise. It places before us the great drama of Heaven and Earth in their reciprocal action: God speaking in word and deed, man replying out of the depths of his soul. Compared with this, how trifling are the themes of the best poetry of Greece and Rome—the raptures of earthly love, the pleasures of wine and the feast, or even the prowess and achievements of mighty national heroes! The siege of Troy and the fortunes of the house of *Œdipus* dwindle into utter insignificance in the presence of this sublime manifestation of the living God in the scenes of creation and the destinies of nations and men. How local and transient is the interest awakened by all other poetry, except so far as it echoes the grand truths which Israel gave as a heritage to the world! But Hebrew poetry has a sweep as broad as the universe in which God dwells, and will never cease to inspire and delight as long as the human heart can make response to God. Its great, almost its sole thought is God, the living God. In His light it views all things and measures the significance of all events. "With Thee is the fountain of

life; in Thy light shall I see light." He is the Supreme Good:

"I say to Jehovah, Thou art my Lord;
I have nought that is good beside Thee."—(Ps. xvi. 2.)
"Like the hind when she pants
For the brooks that have water,
Is my soul, O God, in its panting for Thee.
My soul thirsteth for God, for the God that has life;
O when may I come and appear before God?" (xlii. 1, 2).*

This thought of God, in its manifold aspects, is not set forth in abstract terms, but is painted in vivid colors by that master artist, the imagination, and can only be apprehended by a sympathetic imagination, not by the cold, logical understanding. When the poet would make us realize the unsearchableness of God, he says:

"Eloah's hidden depths canst thou find out,
Or Shaddai's utmost limit canst thou reach?
Higher than Heaven's height! what canst thou do?
Deeper than Sheol's depths! what canst thou know?
Its measurement is longer than the earth,
And broader than the sea."—(Job xi. 7-9.)

This is not the language of metaphysics, but of the imagination. It places before the mind a truer and more glorious picture than ever philosopher sketched.

And so when the poet describes the attributes of God, we move not among shadowy abstractions, but rather among living realities. From among the many pictures of God's power take this from Job (ix. 5-12):

"'Tis He that moves the mountains, and they know it not;
Who overturneth them in His fierce wrath;
Who makes the earth to tremble from its place,
Its strong foundations rock;
'Tis He who bids the sun, and it withholds its rays;
Who sealeth up the stars;
Who bent the heavens all alone,
And walks upon the mountain waves;

* De Witt's Metrical Version, from which the selections from the Psalms have been taken.

Who made the Bear, Orion and the Pleiades,
The hidden constellations of the South ;
Who doeth mighty works—unsearchable,—
And wonders infinite.

Lo! He goes by me, but I see Him not;
Sweeps past, but I perceive Him not;
See! He assails! then who shall turn him back?
Or who shall say to Him, What doest Thou?"*

And again, have the Divine Omniscience and all-pervading Presence ever been more loftily conceived or more magnificently described than in Ps. cxxxix. 1-12?

"O Lord, Thou hast searched me and known me.
Thou knowest my down-sitting and mine up-rising,
Thou understandest my thought afar off,
Thou searchest out my path and my lying down,
And art acquainted with all my ways;
For there is not a word in my tongue
But lo! Lord, Thou knowest it altogether.
Thou hast beset me behind and before,
And laid Thine hand upon me;
Such knowledge is too wonderful for me;
It is high—I cannot attain unto it.

Whither shall I go from Thy Spirit?
Or whither shall I flee from Thy presence?
If I ascend up into heaven, Thou art there;
If I make my bed in Sheol, behold, Thou art there.
If I take the wings of the morning,
And dwell in the uttermost parts of the sea,
Even there shall Thy hand lead me,
And Thy right hand shall uphold me.
If I say, Surely the darkness shall overwhelm me,
And the light about me shall be night;
Even the darkness hideth not from Thee,
But the night shineth as the day:
The darkness and the light are both alike to Thee."

The mind of the Hebrew poet was deeply impressed by all the changing aspects of the world. He lived close to nature, not as the Greek did, reveling in the delights of mere physical

*Tayler Lewis' Metrical Version, in which the selections from Job are given.

existence and in the enjoyment of æsthetic emotions; nor as the modern scientist does, scanning all external objects, comparing and classifying them that he may trace out the general laws by which the world is governed; but because he saw in all surrounding phenomena a manifestation of the presence of this God.

"The heavens are telling the glory of God,
The firmament sheweth the work of His hands.
Day to day doth pour out speech,
Night to night doth utter knowledge."—(Ps. xix. 1, 2)

Profoundly as he was moved by the powers of nature, he did not feel himself helpless in their grasp. Behind them all, however appalling, his faith discerned the Supreme power, the personal, spiritual, omnipotent God, who holds all the threads of the universe in His hands. The whole course of nature is God's ordinance, and all its processes—the terrific as well as the gentle—are but the freely-chosen modes of His self-manifestation. To Homer and Virgil the world does not mirror the attributes, nor obey the will, of the Olympian gods. At least their empire is divided, and their dominion subject to the fitful impulses of their wayward and often immoral characters. But to the Hebrew poet the world, in all its compass, is but an instrument freely responsive to the merely whispered will of God. It is to this we owe the sublimity of thought, the grandeur of expression and the deep sympathy with nature in all her aspects, that characterize his poetic creations.

Because the Hebrew poet discerns behind the visible scenes of the universe an invisible, yet felt presence, the living Agent active in all the mechanical processes of nature, he does not fear to bring God into closest connection with external phenomena, nor to clothe inanimate objects with the attributes of personality. It is on this account that the nature-poetry of the Old Testament is unsurpassed. Listen, for example, to the Psalmist's magnificent description of a thunder-storm (Ps. xxix. 3-9):

"On the waters the voice of Jehovah!
It is God in His glory that thunders;
Jehovah is on the great waters;
The voice of Jehovah with power!
The voice of Jehovah in grandeur!

The voice of Jehovah is rending the cedars,
The cedars of Lebanon Jehovah is rending;
And He makes them to spring like a calf,
Lebanon and Sirion like young of the deer.
The voice of Jehovah hews out flashes of fire;
The voice of Jehovah convulses the desert;
Jehovah convulses the desert of Kadesh.
The voice of Jehovah brings hinds to their travail,
And the forest strips bare,
While all in his palace cry, Glory."

First of all, you hear the low muttering of the thunder far off to the north; then the storm, sweeping southward and gathering strength with its advance, bursts over Lebanon in wildest fury, breaking her cedars as if they were frail reeds, and making the mountains tremble to their rocky base,—the lightning, meanwhile, sending forth its terrific flashes, until, spending its remaining strength on the wilderness of Kadesh, whose trees it strips of their foliage, and whose hinds it brings to the birth-throes, its voice is at last hushed, and we hear instead the angelic choir in Jehovah's palace singing, "Glory." And this shows that the interest of the poet is not in the storm, as such, a mere natural phenomenon. It is nothing to him, save as a splendid manifestation of God's glory. Therefore, before he begins his description, he lifts his eyes upward, and calls on the angels surrounding God's throne, to give to Him the glory due His name:

"Give Jehovah, ye sons of the mighty,
Give glory and strength to Jehovah;
Give Jehovah the glory of His name;
O worship Jehovah in holy attire."

Hebrew poetry is especially grand when it describes Jehovah as going forth in His wrath for the salvation of His people.

Then we have the sublimest imagery, the boldest personifications, and the most startling anthropomorphisms. His voice roars out of His palace; He bends the heavens and comes down, thick darkness under His feet; a smoke mounts up from His nostrils, and a fire consumes from His mouth; He rides on a cherub, swept along by the wings of the wind; the darkness a screen round about Him, and out of the darkness hailstones and flashes of fire; He thunders from heaven, shoots forth His arrows and scatters His enemies; and, at His threatening, at the blast of the breath of His nostrils, even the waters flee away and lay bare the bed of the sea. Of the many theophanies described in the poetry of the Old Testament, listen to the one so vividly painted in the Song of Habakkuk (Hab. iii):

"God came from Teman,
And the Holy One from Mount Paran.
His glory covered the heavens,
And the earth was full of His praise.
And His brightness was as the light;
He had rays coming forth from His hand;
And there was the biding of His power.
Before Him went the pestilence,
And fiery bolts went forth at His feet.
He stood and measured the earth;
He beheld, and drove asunder the nations;
And the eternal mountains were scattered,
The everlasting hills did bow;
His goings were as of old.
I saw the tents of Cushan in affliction,
The curtains of the land of Midian did tremble.
Was Jehovah displeased against the rivers?
Was Thine anger against the rivers,
Or Thy wrath against the sea,
That Thou didst ride upon Thine horses,
Upon Thy chariots of salvation?
Thy bow was made quite bare;
The oaths to the tribes were a sure word.
Thou didst cleave the earth with rivers;
The mountains saw Thee, and were afraid;
The tempest of waters passed by:
The deep uttered His voice,
And lifted up his hands on high.

The sun and moon stood still in their habitations;
 At the light of Thine arrows as they went,
 At the shining of Thy glittering spear.
 Thou didst march through the land in indignation,
 Thou didst thresh the nations in anger.
 Thou wentest forth for the salvation of Thy people,
 For the salvation of Thine anointed;
 Thou woundest the head out the house of the wicked,
 Laying bare the foundation even unto the neck.
 Thou didst pierce with his own staves the head of his warriors:
 They came as a whirlwind to scatter me;
 Their rejoicing was as to devour the poor secretly.
 Thou didst tread the sea with Thine horses,
 The heap of mighty waters."

There is a passage in the Book of Job transcendently sublime, in which God discloses a momentous truth through a spirit of the night. It is a weird scene at the solemn hour of midnight. The world is wrapt in deep unbroken slumber. Only Eliphaz tosses sleepless on his couch, unable to shut out the disturbing visions conjured up by perplexing anxious thoughts. Then suddenly a terrible fear seizes him and all his bones shake. A living, breathing Presence flits before him, making his hair stand on end. To his horror, it pauses before his eyes, a vague, indistinct, shadowy shape. A moment of awful silence follows, and then a low, murmuring voice out of the darkness, asks: "Is mortal man more just than God? Is boasting man more pure than He who made him?" The passage runs thus:

"To me, at times, there steals a warning word;
 Mine ear its whisper seems to catch.
 In troubled thoughts from spectres of the night,
 When falls on men the vision—seeing trance,—
 And fear has come, and trembling dread,
 And made my every bone to thrill with awe,—
 'Tis then before me stirs a breathing form,
 O'er all my flesh it makes the hair rise up.
 It stands; no face distinct can I discern;
 An outline is before mine eyes;
 Deep silence! then a voice I hear:
 'Is mortal man more just than God?
 Is boasting man more pure than He who made him'" (iv. 12-17)?

That is word painting of the highest order, and it would go hard to match it anywhere in the literature of the world.

As the Hebrew poet has, in his conception of God, mounted up to what is highest and truest and grandest in the realm of thought, so has he also, in the outpouring of his emotion, revealed what is deepest and purest and most ennobling in human feeling. He has sounded the inmost depths of the heart in its response to God's infinite majesty and goodness, holiness and righteousness, long-suffering and compassion. The Psalter, especially, witnesses to the most intimate communings with God. It is throughout the voice of man to God, the cry of the child to its Father, now thrilling with gladness, now wailing out its griefs. There is hardly an experience in the religious life to which it has not given such a true and full form of expression, that it has served ever since as the model for prayer and the vehicle for praise. It is this welling up in it of the deepest fountains of the human soul in its intercourse with God that gives to the Psalms their marvelous universality and their unrivaled attractiveness. In spite of their local, temporal and national coloring, they mount up into spiritual regions where the distinctions of sex and race, of clime and age, are lost sight of in the deeper unity of religious needs, aspirations and hopes. The utterances of a human heart fully conscious of its spiritual relations, they have a reality and truth capable of touching every other human heart in its higher and highest life, and teach it to pour forth its adoration and praise, its feeling of sin and its sense of pardon, its victories and its defeats, its fearlessness before man and its calm repose in God. Even our blessed Lord, in the hour of His supreme agony, could find no better expression of His feelings than in the Psalmist's words: "My God, my God, why hast Thou forsaken me?"

The hymns of adoration, in which Hebrew poetry is so rich, are unexcelled among men. Nor is this so surprising as at first blush it might seem. They are notes of praise to Israel's God. How much that meant to the chosen people of old, we fail to

comprehend. It is easy for us to say, God reigns omnipotent in the heavens and makes the forces of nature and history subservient to His sovereign will. Ethical monotheism has become wrought into the very texture of our thoughts. It seems to us almost incredible, hardly conceivable, that men should ever have believed otherwise than that God is an infinite, personal Spirit, omnipresent, omnipotent, and invested with the higher moral attributes of justice and holiness, mercy and love. But at the time when the Hebrew bards sang, this conception was known to a very small territory, and, from a worldly point of view, to a very insignificant people. It was the great prophets and psalmists of Israel who made belief in the one, only, personal, spiritual God, the common possession of their race, and through their race, of the civilized world. And so, when these noble singers turn their gaze away from the vain idols of the nations to their own God, the God of Israel, "that sitteth on the circle of the earth, and the inhabitants thereof are as grasshoppers; that stretcheth out the heavens as a curtain, and spreadeth them as a tent to dwell in;" "the everlasting God, Jehovah, the Creator of the ends of the earth," who "fainteth not, neither is weary," and who reneweth the strength of them that wait on Him, so that "they shall mount up with wings as eagles; they shall run and not be weary; they shall walk and not faint," is it surprising that in the presence of this God, who chose Israel as His peculiar people, they should burst out in strains of adoration and praise, such as men had never heard before, and have never been surpassed since?

"O come, let us sing to Jehovah,
Let us shout to the rock of salvation,
Let us come with thanksgiving before Him,
With psalms let us shout His praise,
For Jehovah is God very great,
Above all the gods the Great King;
In whose hand are the depths of the earth,
And the wealth of the mountains is His;
The sea, too, is His, for He made it,
And His hands have formed the dry land.
O come, bowing down let us worship,

Let us kneel to Jehovah, our Maker;
For He is our God,
And we are the people of His care,
The flock of His hand;
O that to-day ye would hearken to His voice."

—(Ps. xciv. 1-7.)

Such is their high-wrought enthusiasm for Jehovah, that they would proclaim His name to all the world.

"Oh, sing a new song to Jehovah;
Yea, sing, all the earth, to Jehovah;
Raise your song to Jehovah, and bless ye His name;
Proclaim every day His glad news of salvation;
Declare in the nations His glory;
Let the peoples all know of His wonders.

For Jehovah is great, and all worthy of praise,
And above all gods to be feared,
For the gods of the nations are all things of nought,
But the heavens were made by Jehovah,
In His presence are grandeur and glory;
In His holy place splendor and strength."—(Ps. xcvi. 1-6.)

They invoke all heaven and earth to praise His holy name.

"Praise ye, Jehovah!
From the heavens give praise to Jehovah;
Give Him praise in the heights;
Give Him praise, all His angels;
Give Him praise, all his hosts;
Give Him praise, sun and moon,
And let all the bright stars give Him praise;
Praise Him, O heaven of heavens,
And ye waters that are higher than the heavens."

—(Ps. cxlviii. 1-4.)

When the Psalmist considers the eternity of God, he is filled with a mournful sense of the brevity and transitoriness of life, and vividly portrays his painful, though not hopeless mood, in a lyric of which it is not too much to say, with Isaac Taylor, that it is "perhaps the most sublime of human compositions; the deepest in feeling, the loftiest in theological conception, the most magnificent in its imagery."

"Lord, Thou art a home for us in all generations:
 Ere the hills were brought forth,
 Or yet Thou hadst formed the earth and the world,
 Through the ages everlasting Thou art God.

To the dust Thou restorest the mortal;
 Thou sayest, "Return, ye children of men."
 For a thousand years in Thine eyes
 Are like yesterday's passing,
 Or a watch in the night.

Thou sweepest them off as a flood, and they sleep;
 They are like grass that springs up in the morning,
 In the morning springs up, and it blossoms,
 At eve is cut down, and it withers;
 For Thine anger consumes us,
 By Thy wrath we are dismayed;
 Our transgressions Thou settest before Thee,
 In the light of Thy presence the deeds we conceal.

For all our days turn away in Thy wrath,
 Our years we pass off like a sigh.
 Threescore and ten are the years of our life,
 Or fourscore if strength should avail;
 Yet their proudest are toilsome and vain:
 For they are soon cut off, and we fly.
 But who has yet learned the power of Thine anger,
 And Thy wrath so measured by the reverence due Thee?
 So teach us to number our days,
 That our heart may attain unto wisdom."—(Ps. xc. 1-12.)

When he views himself in the light of God's spotless holiness, he pours forth a prayer characterized by such a profound conviction of sin, such a full and unfeigned confession, such a true and sincere penitence, such a deep-felt desire for pardon and such humble trust in God's forgiving love, as can be seen nowhere among the literary productions of men, to the same extent and in the same purity as in the fifty-first Psalm.

"Show me pity, O God, in Thy great loving kindness,
 As Thy mercies abound, my transgressions blot out;
 From my guilt wash me thoroughly,
 From my sin make me clean.

For I, oh I know my transgressions,
And alway my sin is before me;
Against Thee, Thee alone have I sinned,
And this evil have done in Thy sight;
That Thy charge may prove just,
And Thy judgment be faultless.

Lo, in guilt was I born,
And in sin did my mother conceive me;
Lo, Thy pleasure is truth deep within;
In the part that is hid give me knowledge of wisdom,
With hyssop branch cleanse me, I then shall be pure;
If Thou wash me, I thus shall be whiter than snow.

Joy and gladness again let me have,
That the bones Thou hast crushed may rejoice;
Hide Thy face from my sins,
And all my guiltiness blot from Thy book.

Create for me, Lord, a pure heart,
Yes, renew a right spirit within me;
And cast me not off from Thy presence;
Thy Spirit of holiness, take Thou not from me,
My joy in Thy power of salvation restore,
Let a willing spirit uphold me;
Then will I teach transgressors Thy way,
And the sinner to Thee shall return.

Deliver me from bloodshed,
O God, my God of salvation;
Let my tongue of Thy righteousness sing;
Lord, open my lips,
And my mouth shall publish Thy praise,
For sacrifice slain is not Thy delight,
Or this would I bring Thee;
Burnt offerings can give Thee no joy;
A broken spirit is sacrifice pleasing to God;
A heart broken and contrite,
O God, Thou wilt not despise."—(Ps. li. 1-17.)

And then when the burden of guilt has been lifted from his soul, what a note of exultant gladness he sounds forth in the thirty-second Psalm:

"How happy is he
Whose transgression is pardoned,
Whose sin is forgiven;

How happy the man
 Unto whom Jehovah imputeth no guilt,
 In whose soul no deceit can be found.

While I spake not,
 My bones were worn out
 By my outcries all the day long;
 For Thy hand day and night lay heavy upon me,
 My moisture was turned into mid-summer drought.

Then to Thee I acknowledged my sin,
 I concealed not my guilt;
 I said, 'I confess my ill deeds to Jehovah,'
 And Thou didst lift off the guilt of my sin.

Be glad in Jehovah, rejoice, O ye righteous,
 And joyfully shout, ye upright in heart."—(Ps. xxxii. 1-5, 9.)

Or if you ask for an expression of firm, unflinching trust in God, listen to the ringing words of the forty-sixth Psalm:

"We have God on our side, a refuge and a fortress,
 A help in distress to be found without fail;
 Therefore we fear not when the earth is all changed,
 And the mountains are shaken in the heart of the sea;
 Let its waters roar and boil up,
 Let the mountains quake with their swelling."

—(Ps. xvi. 1-3.)

Hebrew poetry, and especially the Psalter, while it is truly divine, is yet intensely human, and embodies those sentiments and emotions that spring from men's unchanging relations to God. It is poetry which all men, of whatever race or clime, can read with sympathetic interest. Here all feel something akin to what is most real in their own lives. The poet's dangers and conflicts, his temptations and struggles, his painful sense of weariness and longing for divine assistance are common to human life. They are old, yet ever new, and will never cease to find an echo in other hearts as long as human life is darkened by the shadow of sin and sorrow, bereavement and death. Other poetry is of abiding value only as far as it is pervaded by the truth and reality of life which Israel's inspired singers first disclosed to the world. If it touches man in his highest spirit-

ual relations, at those vital points which are of universal permanent interest, it will suffer no old age. Otherwise it may charm for awhile, as in some festive moment; but when the stern realities of life weigh upon the soul—sickness and suffering, sin and death—even the most beautiful odes of Horace and Anacreon seem but a hollow mockery, and we turn from them for comfort to such a Psalm as the twenty-third:

"Jehovah is my Shepherd,
I suffer no want;
In pastures of verdure He makes me lie down,
By the rest-giving waters He leads me;
He refreshes my soul
And along the right paths
For His Name's sake He guides me.

Yea, e'en when I walk in the valley of the shadow of death,
No ill do I fear, for Thou art beside me,
Thy sceptre and staff are my comfort.
A table Thou preparest before me,
In front of my foes;
My head Thou anointest with oil,
And alway my cup is o'erflowing,
Then only shall follow me goodness and love
All the days of my life,
And for days long extended,
I shall dwell in the house of Jehovah."—(Ps. xxiii.)

II.

THE GRACIOUS TRUTH OF CHRIST.

BY PROF. WILLIAM H. RYDER, D.D.

"The law was given by Moses; grace and truth came by Jesus Christ."—
John i. 17.

It is very trite to say that we live in an age of transition. It has become so, not simply because it has been often said during the last twenty years, but because it, or something like it, has been repeatedly said or thought during the past eighteen hundred years.

Christianity entered the world at a time when men's conceptions of truth and duty were passing through great changes. It was planted among people—Jews, Greeks, Romans,—whose political, social and religious ideas were in an intense flux, many of whom were "spending their time in nothing else but either to tell or to hear some new thing," and Christianity, instead of calming at once this spirit of inquiry and unrest, intensified it; it began to "turn the world upside down." It is not at all surprising that serious, conservative men, the rulers of the Jewish Church and of the Roman State, were alarmed, and felt that the peace of society, the maintenance of good government and the preservation of religious faith demanded the suppression of this new movement at any cost. And Christianity has made its progress, in very large measure, under similar conditions, and in the same spirit and method. We like to think of it as winning the world simply by quiet and gentle influences, by convincing and sweetly transforming men—building up its kingdom in the earth, as the light and warmth of the sun build up a tree. This might be if Christianity had entered

a world where all men were innocent and wise, as ready to discern and respond to gracious influences as are the elements of the earth, and as quick to gather into organic life about some new germ. But Christianity, whenever it attempts to make an advance, must meet ignorance, prejudice, a timid and obstinate conservatism. Its progress must, therefore, be attended with turnings and overturnings. It must be especially alert in those times when men's views are changing, and if it will cure the restlessness of human hearts, it must first deepen that restlessness.

Every student of the New Testament and of the times of Christ and His apostles must be impressed with striking resemblances between that period and the period in which we live. That age, like this, was an age of commerce and travel. Then, as now, the nations which were shaping the life of the world, were open-minded, progressive nations. As we have already noted, there was then, as now, a loss of faith in older conceptions of truth, and a growing impatience with them, attended, at the same time, with an increasing desire for truth and reality. The task to which Jesus set His hand, and which He committed to His disciples, was much like that which rests upon pious and intelligent men of this generation—to assist, with firmness and courage, in this breaking up of older systems, and at the same time to hold firmly to all the truth which had been revealed to men in the past, and to reconstruct and revitalize it for the present and for future generations.

Our text brings before us, in certain aspects, this two-fold duty. "The law was given by Moses, but grace and truth came by Jesus Christ." The older revelation, as compared with the newer, was human, and therefore transient—the newer was more spiritual and more divine, and therefore contained, in larger measure, those elements which must be permanent. To avoid misapprehension I must delay a moment to define myself more carefully. I do not mean to intimate that any real revelation from God contains defective and untrue elements, which therefore must pass away with a

better knowledge of truth. So far as God really spoke to the inspired men of the older dispensation, He uttered the eternal truth; but this truth could be received by imperfect men only in imperfect forms. All life which comes from God is *perfect* life; the defects and deformities of nature are due simply to the limitations which are imposed upon life, the incapacity of nature to receive it in its perfection. So the defective and transient elements connected with the earlier revelations of God are not really parts of those revelations,—they mark simply the limit in the capacity to receive divine truth. How clearly Jesus recognizes this principle. He came, not to destroy the law and the prophets, but to fulfill—to make more clear, comprehensive and commanding the old revelation. Moses, because of the hardness of men's hearts, permitted certain limits in the application of the law of love and constancy, but it was not so at the beginning. God revealed His eternal purpose in the creation,—and progress is only the return to the divine ideal thus revealed. And certainly, when we speak of the progress of Christianity, we do not mean that it has progressed away from the revelation which was made in Christ, but, rather, that that revelation made to men but imperfectly prepared to comprehend it, has so wrought in human thought and life that it has prepared men to understand it more perfectly, and that all Christian progress is progress towards Christ and not away from Him or beyond Him.

But let us consider more at length these two sides, or elements, of a vital and growing Christianity.

I. Such a Christianity must be constantly purifying itself of those foreign elements, of those imperfections and limitations with which it inevitably combines, when it is accepted, and practiced, and promulgated, by imperfect men. Consider the conditions under which Christianity first became a conscious force in the world. Three races had been prepared by the providence of God, to receive the germ of this new faith and life; the Jew, with his religious zeal and earnestness; the Greek, with his intellectual cultivation and his philosophy; the Roman, with

his passion for political and social order; and these different conceptions had crossed and interwoven. Here was rare preparation, to be sure, for the reception and nourishment of the new life, but I need not delay to prove that there was much that was crude and erroneous, and that Christianity absorbed from this soil in which it grew, not only the pure, but, to some large degree, the impure elements. The proportion of some of these elements was, also, much increased by its early transplantation to a foreign soil. It is hard to see just what Christianity would have become if it had struck its roots firmly into Judaism and remained there long enough to gain fixity of form and firmness of fiber. It probably would have been less fitted to its mission. Its first, and its wonderful success was, doubtless, in large measure, due to its immaturity and plasticity. And yet we can see that, from this very fact, it was moulded into forms which were not native to it, and that the very wealth of vitality which it possessed, compelled it to lay hold of and to appropriate elements which were quite foreign to the simplicity of Christ. It absorbed a foreign philosophy of religion; it appropriated foreign ecclesiastical ideas; its ethics felt the influence of Roman social life; its idea of God was a revived Platonism. Its very success wrought its transformation. And to say all this is not to deny the good there was in this transformation. It is not only inevitable that that which conquers men should feel its own life modified by the conquered, but it is a right and blessed dispensation. Perhaps this early influence of alien life and faith upon Christianity would have been only good if it had not been so persistent; but, since those early days, Christianity has had no other opportunity to win to itself a highly cultivated people. The great mass of its converts have been either those who have been trained from childhood under Christian institutions, or uncultivated savages. Christianity has therefore carried, in all its progress, the ideas which it absorbed during the first three centuries of its life. These have been unconsciously modified; sometimes quite materially revised, but they have never been put to that search-

ing test which would be involved in the successful proclamation of the Gospel to a people who had been trained in another philosophy, and another conception of life. Perhaps we shall see this test applied in the Christianizing of Japan. We are witnessing something which has points of resemblance to it in the more or less conscious effort of Christianity to shape itself to new conceptions of nature, of history, and of society. If Christianity is going to continue the noble warfare of the past, it cannot carry all its heavy armor or cumbersome baggage. If it is going to meet the skepticism which, it must be admitted, the investigations of the age are producing in many minds, and answer the earnest questions which are being put to it, it must learn to be simple, clear, practical. Religion has, of necessity, its mysteries—it combines truth and conduct, theory and practice, but so does everything else which is of real significance to men. There is a sense, too, in which dogma goes before conduct, and inspires and directs it. Truth must always control action. When I say that the age demands a simple and practical Christianity, I do not mean that it shall be without thought and reflection, but only that those elements of Christian dogma which have ceased to be real, shall be cheerfully sacrificed, that its mysteries shall not be formulated as fixed and unchangeable truths, which men must accept in definite forms before they can share full fellowship in Christian privilege and labor, and that all men shall be invited to look at truth calmly, with open mind, and to accept it only as it justifies itself to the intelligence and wins the heart. But is it not plain that the cultivation of this habit will involve some work of destruction? that the re-statement of Christian truth, with the constant testing question—not, what is old, and therefore sacred, but, what is true? not what has helped men of other ages, but what will help men of our age?—will involve a creed of very different proportions from any which has been framed in the past? Now, this work of exposure and destruction is often an ungracious task, painful to him who prosecutes it, and to those with whom and for whom he would labor. We often shirk it, or leave it to

born iconoclasts or rude fanatics. But is that right? Is it not the work which needs, more than almost any other, a calm, judicial mind and a gentle heart? If we need a surgeon we desire that he should be of this temper of mind and heart. If some news must be communicated, which at first will pain and shock, we seek some calm and kindly man to discharge the painful duty. The calmest, gentlest man the world has ever seen was the most destructive. He put his finger on the sacred tradition of the elders, and it withered under His touch. He brought His new view of truth and life into contact with old and stable forms of civilization, and they fell in ruins. He came not to send peace, but a sword. And the true follower of Christ must follow Him in this respect. It is a part of his mission to turn the world upside down, because, to so large a degree, the wrong side of it is still uppermost. Indeed, the world is like a farmer's field: it must be frequently overturned, or it will lose its fruitfulness.

II. But our text lays its emphasis upon the positive, permanent, constructive side of religious thought and labor. "Grace and truth came by Jesus Christ." I do not think that we have here two distinct things defined, but one thing looked at from two points of view. The same thing is both grace and truth. It is a true grace, or a gracious truth, which came through Christ. It is that truth which expresses and embodies the grace of God. Christ did not aim to teach and enforce any other truth than this. He did not teach the doctrines of science, the facts of history, the principles of criticism, or the dogmas of theology. He came to seek and to save men, and He taught that truth which pertains to salvation.

It is here that we find, if I may so express it, His permanent contribution to thought and life. But this does not involve a narrow view of what Christ has done directly, and with full purpose for the guidance of the thought, as well as the conduct, of men. Let us note some things which are involved in this kind of truth.

First, He taught a new doctrine of the unity of men, and

taught it in such a way that it became a permanent factor in the conceptions and the efforts of men. Observe the way in which He taught this most fruitful doctrine. He did not rest it upon any scientific theory of the origin of man, or even upon the Biblical account of his creation. He showed a remarkable reserve about such matters, which His disciples did not always cultivate. It is Paul, and not Jesus, who speaks of all men being of one blood, and reasons of the moral unity of men through their common relation with Adam. Jesus says nothing about such matters, but supports His doctrine by entirely different considerations.

Note the bearing upon this conception of humanity of that title which He constantly applied to Himself—*The Son of Man*. Of all the names which were applied to the coming Saviour that was the one which He chose. He did not often call Himself the Messiah, though He accepted the title when others applied it to Him. He did not speak of Himself as the Son of David, and He showed that those who used this term of Him who was to be David's Lord, failed to understand its true import. He did not often call Himself the Son of God, though often enough to show his consciousness of a right to this exalted name. He tried constantly to impress upon men that He was the Son of Man, that His relation, and His mission, were with the race, not with some fraction of it, and that men would find their lost unity in their common Saviour.

The same truth was impressed by His constant reference to the fatherhood of God. His own consciousness of Sonship was so conceived and expressed as to lead men to realize that, with all its singularity and its majesty, it was the pledge and bond of union between God and all men. It made Him, not only the recipient of a supreme revelation, but the Mediator of it, so that no one knew the Father but the Son, and he to whom the Son wished to reveal Him,—that is, reveal Him as Father—teach and convince of the fatherhood of God. As his Apostle says, it was the purpose of God to conform other men to the image of his Son, that He might be the first-born among many brethren.

The same doctrine is involved, also, in His teaching concerning the Kingdom of Heaven. The phrase came out of the vocabulary of Judaism, but it gained from the lips of Jesus a broader and more spiritual meaning. It became a kingdom for humanity, into which all men were to be admitted through repentance and faith,—a kingdom which was to unite all men who would enter it into one great company. Now this conception of the unity of men has grown in importance as the centuries have gone by. We have come to see that one man, or one race of men, cannot gain a full redemption, or reach perfection, in isolation from other men, and that we can save one man, or one class of men, only by saving society. The old conception of plucking men as brands from the burning—of saving a man here and there—we have come to see is not only narrow, but impossible. A saved man is not a man whose relations with the world have been severed,—the very process wounds and tears him and leaves him but a fragment of a man. He must be saved in society, not from it. His own life reaches its fullness only as he is conscious that he belongs to a great society, and feels the life-currents of the world flowing through his own veins. And the more fully we realize this in our study of the life of the Church, and in the experience of Christians, the more clearly do we see that it was the thought of Christ,—that it is one of those abiding truths which His life and teaching have communicated to the world, and which the history of the world and the experience of men have simply received and verified.

At the same time, Christ has taught men to recognize the dignity and worth of the individual, as they had never been recognized before. There is a sense in which the unity of, at least, certain classes of men had been much emphasized before Christ lived and taught. Each man lived for his nation, his tribe, or clan, and his own life and comfort were to be ignored and despised when the interest of his society was involved. But this was so conceived and practiced as to compress and degrade the individual, not to expand and elevate him. Christ taught that one wandering soul was worthy the Divine Shep-

herd's toilsome care and love. No soul can be thus brought home in the Master's arms, without realizing, in his depths of humility, his own priceless worth; and that is a lesson which is essential to a really complete salvation. It is quite as necessary to aggressive and successful labor for men.

The "Saviours of Society" have often been reckless and contemptuous of men. Christ never showed contempt for men. He rebuked men, He exposed their sins and weaknesses, He was indignant with their cruelty and selfishness, He threatened them with bitter woes; but He would never let them forget that they were born to be the children of God, and that each soul was precious in God's sight. Moreover, while He taught men that their full life was in society and as members of the kingdom, He made them ready, also, to follow their own light, to cultivate personal conscientiousness and independence of decision and action, so that He led them to see the wisdom of the paradox, to leave home and friends for the sake of the kingdom of heaven,—to sacrifice the narrower social relations to promote the larger. Are we not learning, too, that as a man can be fully redeemed only as society is redeemed, so too, society can be saved only as each man is brought to the stature of a perfect man? This, too, is one of those permanent factors of idea and of effort, which Christ has implanted in the world.

Another gracious truth, bearing in the same direction, is the doctrine of the salvability of men. It is not strange that pure and loving men are often sad and pessimistic. The world is very evil. "Man is born to trouble as the sparks fly upward." Sin has reigned in the world with a heavy, cruel hand. The great mass of men seem to yield to its power with hardly a struggle. Those who make the most earnest effort against it are often defeated, and far too often shamefully routed. The progress of the world towards righteousness is slow, vacillating, and uncertain. But how did Jesus Christ look upon this problem of human salvation? He by no means ignored its seriousness and difficulty. The soul must enter into life by a narrow gate and through a straitened way. He who will be

saved must *strive* to enter in, for many who seek to shall not be able. He must be ready to sell all that he has, to break the closest and most sacred ties of life, to bear his cross daily, to submit to reproach and pain and death. Yet Jesus never for a moment doubted that multitudes of souls could, and would, be saved in this way—on these conditions. Not only did He put a large estimate upon the power of divine grace, but, also, upon the capacity of men to receive and respond to that grace. It is a striking fact that the life and teaching which have brought to all men the deepest sense of sin and weakness, have brought to them also the sense of dignity and power. Observe, too, in how simple and practical a way he taught this lesson. Sometimes by revealing to a soul its own moral nobility and worthiness. "Behold an Israelite, indeed, in whom there is no guile," He says to a sincere and earnest, though evidently a narrow man, and the words of commendation were a revelation to that man, not only of the Teacher, but of himself. He saw that that searching eye had seen the real sincerity in his heart, which doubt and conscious weakness had often concealed from himself. Jesus was never afraid of promoting vanity, or teaching false doctrine, by appealing to what was really good in a penitent and trustful heart. To a woman who had been a *sinner* He says, "Thy faith hath saved thee; go in peace." Truly, in such words, grace came by Jesus Christ. But it was more than grace, it was truth too,—it was gracious truth. The woman was saved by *faith*, by the mighty effort of her own soul to lay hold of the redeeming grace of Christ. She could never have been saved if she had not had the power to appropriate this blessing. And Jesus' gracious words taught her, and teach all sinful souls, not to look to God with one despairing glance before they sink forever, but, while they look to God, to look within also—to recognize and to value as they should, the divinely given capacity for salvation, and to *lay hold* upon eternal life. To all Christian laborers He taught the same lesson. "Come with me, and I will make you fishers of men," are the words with which He begins His Galilean

ministry. "Go, and disciple all nations," is His last commission to His disciples. Jesus never ceased to hope for men, to believe in them, to detect the faintest effort after a better life, to appeal to it and to strengthen it, and to make it the germ for the propagation of faith and goodness in other souls. He sees Peter's weakness and predicts his fall, but He sees his strength too, and predicts his recovery, and, even while His disciple stands on the threshold of his sin, He says to him, "When thou art converted *strengthen thy brethren.*" To the same disciple, penitent and humbled, He says: "Lovest thou me? . . . Feed my sheep." Thus, in many ways, did He teach this gracious truth—that human life is not hopeless, that men can be saved; and with all the pessimism which reigns in human hearts, that blessed truth is one of the permanent facts of life and labor.

I have referred thus, by way of illustration, and with no purpose or effort to cover the whole ground, to the kind of truth which Jesus either communicated to the world—or, if He found it here, made really potent among the forces which rule the world. It is the *nature* of this truth which gives us our sense of security in the Gospel; it is hopeful, not depressing truth. A gospel which lays its emphasis on the dark side of life is no gospel; it may have power to condemn, but it has no power to save. It is simple, practical, experimental truth; it does not demand profound learning, or great metaphysical ability to apprehend it, to practice, or to proclaim it. A gospel which makes such demands even of its leaders, is not a gospel; it may be true, but it is not gracious truth; it is the doctrine of a school, not the contents of a message of salvation. This truth of Christ makes its direct appeal to the common consciousness and common needs of men,—the sense of sin and weakness, the desire for a better life, the underlying, though often latent, or dormant, faith in God, the *hope* of immortality; and it treats these convictions, not as parts of a matured, systematized knowledge, but rather as the contents of feeling and of faith,—teaching us to be willing to walk by faith, to be hopeful where we cannot know,

to be true to the guiding star of duty and of love, even when we walk in darkness and in doubt.

And is not this the kind of truth our age is longing for? It is impatient with elaborate, fine-spun systems, with balanced, sounding phrases, with mysterious dogmas, and with dogmatic mysteries. It will not dispute the preacher who presents such things,—perhaps it is too indifferent to dispute him—but it will not respond to them as the world once did, as, perhaps, the world will again some time. But never were men more eager for that truth which they know they need,—the truth which will help them to live pure, honest and hopeful lives; to deny themselves, to bear their cross in patience, and to die in peace. And whatever else Christ taught, this is the very heart of the gospel, “Grace and truth came by Jesus Christ.”

III.

REFORMED CHURCH DOCTRINES.*

BY REV. S. Z. BEAM, D.D.

MAN'S ONLY COMFORT.

CHAPTER I.

Jesus Christ saves—The Father preserves in Him—The Holy Spirit assures us of Eternal Life.

THE first or introductory Lord's Day, of our excellent Catechism (which is the only symbol of doctrine adopted by the Reformed Church in the United States), directs the attention of the catechumen to the sources of his "only comfort in life and death." In so doing it opens up a mine of spiritual truth, which, for simplicity and depth, is unsurpassed by any standard of doctrine outside of the sacred Scriptures. It is simple enough for the undeveloped mind of youth to see, in it, and lay hold of, the essential truths of the Christian religion. It is deep enough to require the profoundest study of the most learned theologian, who undertakes to expound the mysteries of redemption. It presents a compendium of Christian doctrine, which is as clear and comprehensive as one can desire in a symbol of faith.

The young Christian is taught, † in the very beginning, that his "body and soul" (1) †† alike are to be regarded and treated, not as if they were his own, to be used after his own pleasure, but as the property of his faithful Saviour, Jesus Christ. And this is true "both in life and death." He really belongs to

* This article is an extract from a manuscript commentary on the Heidelberg Catechism.

† The catechumen is addressed by the catechism as a member of the church; in virtue of his baptism, he stands in covenant relation to God.

†† The numbers refer to questions in the Catechism.

Jesus Christ, who, as the incarnate Redeemer, has secured the right to this ownership, by an actual purchase, which involved the price of His own precious blood (Rom. 14: 7-9.)

By this purchase He made full and complete satisfaction for all our sins. And thus, having met and answered all the demands of the Law, and paid the debt of sin for us, He "delivered us from all the power of the devil." As long as sin stood against us, we were under its power, and the arch-enemy of men was able thereby to hold us in spiritual bondage. Thus having us bound in the fetters of sin, he could lead us deeper and deeper into captivity, and farther away from God. But God, manifesting His love in Jesus Christ, intervened for our deliverance from this bondage of corruption. And so the dominion of sin is broken, and the power of the devil overthrown (1 John 3: 8).

As our Saviour has secured us this deliverance, so He also "preserves us" in its possession, that no evil can come upon us, not even the falling of a hair from our head, without our Heavenly Father's notice (Matt. 10: 29-31). But, on the contrary, He so controls everything occurring around us, that by His watchful Providence, all "must be subservient to our salvation" (Rom. 8: 28). By this is meant that, through the mediation of Christ, God governs the world in the interest of His saints, making everything contribute to their happiness.

But, in addition to this outward protection, so graciously afforded us, God also gives us His Holy Spirit to abide in us, and to "assure us of eternal life" (Rom. 8: 16, 17; Eph. 1: 13, 14. Confer 2 Cor. 1: 21, 22). With this blessed assurance, He works in us such obedient faith, that we become "sincerely willing and ready henceforth to live unto Him" (Ps. 110: 3. Confer Luke 1: 68, 69, 74, 75). Thus our life becomes an outward testimony to the truth of our profession, and a means of comfort against the evils we suffer.

This general summary regarding the divine source of our Christian comfort, opens the way for the consideration of the

subject of salvation in its details. And the inquiry presents itself, "How many things are necessary for thee to know, that thou, enjoying this comfort, mayest live and die happy?" (2.)

This knowledge after which we inquire embraces "*three things*": 1. *The greatness of my sin and misery.* 2. *How I am redeemed from all my sins and misery.* 3. *How I am to be thankful to God for such redemption.*

The whole sum of Christian doctrine is embraced under these three heads. This will be apparent if we consider a moment. Sin is in the world, causing misery and death. We need deliverance from a source above us, a strong arm to save, because in ourselves we are helpless. When He who is mighty delivers, He has the right to our gratitude expressed in the highest possible form.

The elucidation of these three essential particulars, which form the substance of true Christian knowledge, will consist in simply an unfolding of the great truths they involve. Their consideration and explanation is the work before us. To this we therefore address ourselves, with the Catechism for our guide, and the Holy Scriptures for our ultimate authority. (The following passages may here be consulted: Rom. 7: 24, 25; Matt. 11: 28, 29, 30; also, Titus 3; 1 Cor. 6.)

We may here remark that this threefold division of the Catechism is based on the Epistle of Paul to the Romans, which discusses these questions in the same order. In the first part St. Paul shows that all, Jews and Gentiles alike, are included under sin and misery. In the second part he shows that Christ has become the Author of salvation to all that believe. And in the third part, he incites the Roman Christians to deeds of gratitude and thankfulness for their salvation. A similar division may be seen briefly stated in Titus 3: 3-9.

THE FIRST PART.
OF THE MISERY OF MAN.

CHAPTER II.

*Man's Misery—God not the Author of sin—Depravity due to Disobedience.
—Man inclined to all Wickedness.*

It needs neither revelation nor argument to prove that mankind is in a state of sin, and consequent misery. The whole history of mankind comes down to us freighted with the burden of sin from the earliest ages, and all along it exhibits the ineffectual efforts of men to cast it off. And present experience daily testifies to the sad effects of sin, by the struggles through which all classes of society are passing. And yet these sad facts are not sufficient to convince men of their own individual sinfulness as the real and true cause of their misery. While we all possess in a greater or less degree a general knowledge of the universal depravity of the race, no one seems to recognize his own personal responsibility for this deplorable state of affairs. And for this reason all our efforts to relieve or remove the sorrows of life are conducted in wrong channels, and, therefore, end in failure. We easily see, and wish to reform, the conduct of others, while we seem to imagine that no such reform is needed in ourselves. It is the guilt of our neighbor, and not of ourselves, which seems to us to cause the trouble. Or if in any sense we find ourselves involved in guilt, we are ever ready, with Adam, to shift the responsibility on some one else: "The woman whom Thou gavest to be with me, she gave me of the tree, and I did eat" (Gen. 3: 12). The expressive couplet of Burns applies here:

"O wad some power the giftie gie us
To see oursel as ithers see us;
It wad frae mony a blunder free us,
And foolish notion."

It is necessary that the knowledge of personal guilt and responsibility should be brought home to the mind and con-

science of every one, in order that he may know how miserable he is, and how his personal wretchedness is due to his own sins. Without this knowledge, no one will take the right course in any of his attempts to free himself from harassing and perplexing difficulties. Indeed, he cannot deliver himself in any case. He must depend on some other power for salvation. But he needs a knowledge of his sin as the source of his wretchedness, in order to look about him to find, if possible, some way of escape.

Happily, God has not forsaken him in his helpless and lost condition. He has not left Himself without witness, nor kept man in ignorance of his lost condition, but has furnished him a means of knowing his inability to save himself, and thereby has given him a motive to impel him to seek relief.

If now, one asks, "Whence can I know my misery?" the answer is, "Out of the Law of God" (3). This law is briefly stated by our Saviour in Matt. 22: 37-40. It requires supreme love to God and unselfish love to men (4). We cannot very well show this supreme love to God except as we exercise loving-kindness to men: "My goodness extendeth not to thee, but to the saints that are in the earth," etc. (Ps. 16: 2, 3). According to this divine Law we must love our neighbor as ourselves; which means that we must do for others the kindness which we expect from them. This law has special application in cases of necessity or distress. If in any case we would wish another to render us assistance, or comfort, or words of encouragement, the Law of Love requires us to render the same acts of beneficence to them, and to all who may need our good offices. By our obedience to this second commandment, we have the opportunity of proving our obedience to the first. But if we "love not our brother whom we have seen, how can we love God whom we have not seen?" (1 John 4: 20). "And this commandment we have from Him, that he who loveth God love His brother also" (1 John 4: 21).

The natural and necessary penalty attached to the violation of this Law, is that we have no claim to relief from God, or from men. And if penalty does not reach us in any outward way,

yet it will come in the lashings of a guilty conscience, from which there is no escape.

The form of words connected with the violation of the Law is, "Cursed is every one that continueth not in all things which are written in the book of the Law to do them."

Now, if we compare our actions with this law of love, everyone must see and confess how far he comes short of a perfect obedience. In fact, we do not obey it, even in our thoughts and intentions, much less in our outward actions. And hence, it is clear, that, "By the Law is the knowledge of sin" (Rom. 3: 20; confer Rom. 7: 7).

In consequence of this proneness to sin, we not only fail "to keep all these things perfectly" (5), but we find our very nature, as affected by sin, disposed "to hate God and our neighbor." And this is the direct contrary of God's Law, which commands us to love God and our neighbor. So it appears we cannot love God and our neighbor (Jer. 13: 23; Rom. 3: 12), because we are inclined to hate them (Rom. 8: 7; John 3: 20. Confer Gal. 5: 19-21; Titus 3: 3.)

Thus, according to the highest authority, namely, the word of God, we cannot perfectly obey God's Law, as long as we are not regenerated by the Spirit of God. And, besides this, a personal examination of our own hearts, and an earnest scrutiny of our motives, must convince us of the justice of the charge which the word of God makes against us. We are selfish in relation to our brother. We expect more from him than we are willing to give to him. Even after we have become children of God we find it necessary to struggle against this selfishness. And this again shows how little we love God, for we are wilfully disobedient. Accordingly, how frequently do we find our hearts rebelling against the ways of God to men, arraigning His Providence, as if He were under obligations to us, rather than we to Him. From all this, it is painfully clear that our misery is made known to us, by the Law of God, as the consequence of our own sin. We are in conflict with it by nature and by practice, and therefore must, in the very nature of things, be subject to its penalty.

CHAPTER III.

Original Righteousness—The Fall—Sinfulness—Inbred and Actual.

Since we find ourselves in this state of sin and misery, in consequence of our rebellion towards God, and hatefulness towards each other, the question naturally arises: "Did God then create us so wicked and perverse" (6)?

As long as men are in a state of nature, unregenerated and unconverted, they feel disposed to cast the blame upon God, because He is the Author of their being. "Did He not create me as I am? Can I think or act contrary to my nature? Why should I be blamed for doing what human nature is inclined to do?" Thus the sinner attempts to ease his conscience. He finds an excuse for his sins by shifting the responsibility upon his Creator.

But God assures us in His word that everything He created, including man, was good, when it came from the Creator's hand (Gen 1: 31). Hence, it appears that God, by no means, created man wicked and perverse. "He created man good, and after His own image" (6), even in His "likeness" (Gen. 1: 27). This does not refer to any bodily likeness or image, for God is not body, but Spirit. It is God's moral and spiritual likeness which furnished the model after which man was created. It is "His righteousness and holiness," or His moral purity and freedom from sin. Thus, originally, man was righteous and holy, as he came from the hands of the Creator. Of course, this righteousness and holiness were of a negative character: that is, he had not done anything bad. So he was in harmony, morally and spiritually, with God. To restore him to this high position is one of the objects of redemption (Eph. 4: 24), that those who are saved, may "put on the new man, which, after God, is created in righteousness and true holiness." God's evident design in the creation of man was to put him in a position, with favorable circumstances, where he might develop his faculties in harmony with the divine will. If, in accord with

this design, he had maintained his integrity, he would have advanced to a position of positive righteousness and holiness. Thus he would have come to a right knowledge of God, his Creator. Then, too, he would have learned to love God with all his heart, and showed himself worthy "to live with Him in eternal happiness, to glorify and praise Him" (6). "The Lord made all for Himself" (Prov. 16: 4); that is, for "His own purposes" (Revised Version, margin), which included the happiness of mankind.

But He also gave man a moral nature, endowing him with reason and will, and with the power of choice. And to afford an opportunity for the exercise of these godlike faculties, it was necessary to put him on trial. This trial consisted in testing him, whether he would, with unquestioning confidence, obey the command of God. If he had obeyed he would have confirmed himself, in the righteousness and holiness with which he was endowed in his creation, by his own voluntary choice and act.

Failing, in such obedience to the will of God, he would incur His displeasure, and deprive himself and all his posterity of the divine gifts of righteousness. So far as God was concerned, the trial of our first parents was very simple and very easy. He had given them a pure and holy nature. He had placed them in a beautiful garden. He had made everything agreeable for them. They loved Him and were delighted when God talked with them face to face. God gave them every tree of the garden for food, of which they might freely eat, except "the tree of knowledge of good and evil." Of this tree they were commanded not to eat: for in the day that they would eat of it they would die. Would they eat of this tree, or would they not? (Gen. 2: 15-17.) Would they be satisfied to enjoy all the rest of the fruit of this beautiful garden, and, taking God at His word, refrain from the forbidden fruit? In this consisted the trial. It was no temptation.* God tempts no man. But

* Whatever we may think of divine foreknowledge, or divine foreordination, it is clear that the temptation, presented by the serpent, was no necessary part of the trial. The tempter took advantage of the trial which was to test their obedience, and turned it into a temptation.

the tempter intruded upon them, created distrust in their minds and induced them to eat the forbidden fruit (Gen. 3: 1-7).

Thus they disobeyed God at the instigation of the devil. When we inquire therefore, "Whence proceeds this depravity of human nature" (7), the answer clearly is, "From the fall and disobedience of our first parents, Adam and Eve, in Paradise; hence our nature is become so corrupt that we are all conceived and born in sin."

The corruption of sin, having now taken hold of human nature in its fountain head, it has become a running stream, carrying in its course the poison of sin to all the descendants of Adam. Thus they have become tainted, and every child of Adam comes into this world with a depraved nature, "conceived and born in sin." "By one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned" (Rom. 6: 12). "And Adam begat a son in his own likeness" (Gen. 5: 3. Conf. Ps. 51: 15; John 3: 6).

In this way we have become corrupted in mind and heart and will, so that, in all our faculties, we are inclined to evil, so that we can do nothing really good till we are regenerated by the Spirit of God (8). Our original or inbred sin always develops itself into actual sin as soon as we come to years of accountability. (Rom. 7: 18; 2 Cor. 3: 5; Gen. 8: 21; Job 15: 16.)

But while our nature has become so corrupt, that sinning has become a part of us, we are yet not so totally depraved as to be beyond hope of redemption. The image of God has become sadly and deplorably marred and defaced, but not wholly destroyed, or irretrievably lost. There is yet within us a point of contact, where the Holy Spirit can renew us by a birth from above, and restore this blessed image of God. Christ can be "born in us the hope of glory," and God can "beget us again" to a life of holiness. But we anticipate. We will see more of this later on.

CHAPTER IV.

Man's Free Will—Capability lost by willful Disobedience—Disobedience must be punished—God's Mercy cannot cheat His Justice.

God requires obedience. Free will, an original gift of God to man, made him capable of performing God's will, or of disobeying that will. He chose to disobey. In consequence of this disobedience and rebellion, he is now no longer able to render that obedience which God requires.

"Does not God then wrong man, by requiring of him in His Law that which he cannot perform?" (9). This seems to be a pertinent question. If man had been made with a nature inclined to sin; or if, in his original state, his will had not been free to choose the good, it certainly would have been wrong to require an impossibility from him; and then to hold him responsible for a defect in his nature which he could not overcome or remedy. But God is not at all unjust in His demands; for "He made man capable of performing His will, but man, by the instigation of the devil, and his own willful disobedience, deprived himself and all his posterity, or descendants of those divine gifts" (9), that is, the gifts of righteousness and true holiness. If now this is true, then man must bear the entire responsibility for his inability to please God. For it is due to his own willful choice. "Lo, this have I found, that God hath made man upright, but they have sought out many inventions" (Ecc. 7: 29).

That our first parents were subjected to a severe and subtle temptation, can not be denied, as the history of the fall testifies. (Gen. 3). "The serpent beguiled Eve through his subtlety" (2 Cor. 11: 3). "And by one man's disobedience many were made sinners" (Rom. 5: 19). But the progenitors of our race were in a position to have successfully resisted the temptation, if they had chosen to do so. Though they may not have had the wisdom to detect, in the serpent, the enemy of God and man, they knew that God was true and good. And, therefore, they should have closed their ears to any insinuations that, in

any way, contradicted Him. But alas! they listened; they parleyed; they doubted God's word, and perhaps His goodness. They believed the tempter's lie. They looked longingly at the forbidden but beautiful fruit. They desired to be as gods, knowing good and evil. They sinned in thought, they ate, and fell, and dragged down the race into sin. Henceforth they were incapable, in consequence of their own bad choice, of performing the will of God. Must, therefore, the great and good Lawgiver change the nature of His Law to suit the changed condition of the offenders? That would be contrary to all our ideas of right. For even our perverted sense of moral obligation is not so blunted as to expect a righteous Law to be made unrighteous in order to make a way of escape for those who violate it. The only thing that can be justly done is to let the violated Law have its penalty. And accordingly the Judge of all the earth, who will do only what is right, "will not suffer such disobedience and rebellion to go unpunished" (10).

"He is terribly displeased with sin," and "hates all workers of iniquity" (Ps. 5: 5). "Thou art not a God that hath pleasure in wickedness; neither shall evil dwell with Thee" (Ps. 4: 5). It follows, therefore, that God will punish sin, original and actual, in His just displeasure (10), for it is written, "Cursed is every one," etc. Sin is so obnoxious to His holiness, that He will not, and cannot, let it go unpunished. It is so irreconcilably antagonistic and repugnant to God, that even our original sin, which is but a taint upon human nature, is displeasing to Him (Rom. 5: 14; Eph. 2: 3; Ps. 51: 7). And if our original sin is repugnant to Him, much more does our actual sin deserve His wrath and indignation. And hence in His just judgment He will punish sin; both temporally and eternally, being "angry with the wicked every day" (Ps. 7: 11).

As regards temporal punishment, it is written, "Bloody and deceitful men shall not live out half their days" (Ps. 55: 23). Indeed, in consequence of sin, and God's wrath against it, we all must die after a few years of toil and trouble in the world, according to the divine behest, "The soul that sinneth it shall

die." We all come into the world "with a wail, and go out with a groan." And thus even those who are saved by Christ must yet put off this mortal body in death before their final deliverance is consummated. The writer of the ninetyeth Psalm expresses an overwhelming sense of the frailty and sorrow of man under the wrath of God against sin.

Examples of temporal punishment are vividly and awfully furnished us in the account of the flood (Gen. 6: 12-17, and Gen. 7: 17, et seq.), and in the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah (Gen. 19: 24, 25).

But more terrible still is the Scripture doctrine of eternal punishment, which rests somewhat on the fact of eternal sinning. "Their worm shall not die, neither shall their fire be quenched, and they shall be an abhorring unto all flesh" (Isa. 66: 24. Confer 2 Pet. 2: 9; Rev. 14: 11; Mark 3: 29; Rev. Ver.). As regards the Christian, the evils which he suffers in this world, can be regarded only in the light of divine punishments for sin, in order to discipline us. And, though often such penalties are the consequence of violating nature's laws, yet they are only what we deserve. But, in the case of the unconverted sinners, where such punishments fail to lead them to repentance, they are but the foretaste and prelude of that more awful punishment which awaits them in the world to come. Happy, therefore, is every one who accepts present punishment as the chastisement of a loving Father, who designs thereby to lead him to repentance towards God, and faith towards our Lord Jesus Christ.

But if God is so just that He cannot let sin go unpunished, "Is He not then also merciful" (11)? "God is indeed also merciful," and "His mercy endureth forever." But His mercy in no sense sets aside His justice. There can be no doubt that He pities even the sinner, and cares for him. He preserves him and supplies his wants, though every moment that he continues in rebellion he deserves to die without remedy. And in addition to his preservation, God is continually warning him of his danger, calling upon him to turn from his sins and seek

forgiveness. But still, merciful as He is, "sin which is committed against the most high majesty of God," deserves, as God's justice requires, "to be punished with extreme, that is, with everlasting punishment, both of body and soul." We have a clear statement, declaring both the justice and mercy of God, in Exod. 34: 6, 7, where He put Moses in the cleft of the rock on Sinai, and caused His glory to pass by. "And the Lord passed by before him, and proclaimed, the Lord, the Lord God, merciful and gracious, long-suffering, and abundant in goodness and truth, keeping mercy for thousands, forgiving iniquity and transgression and sin, and that will by no means clear the guilty: visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children, and upon children's children unto the third and to the fourth generation." (Confer 2 Thea. 1: 6-10; Exod. 20: 5.)

From all this, it is easy to see that it must be the height of folly for the sinner to presume upon the mercy of God, as long as he continues to sin against Him. For, "justice and judgment are the habitation of His throne" (Ps. 89: 14). "And He is of purer eyes than to behold evil, and cannot look on iniquity" (Hab. 1: 13). "And the smoke of their torment ascendeth up forever and ever" (Rev. 14: 11). (Confer also Mark 9: 44; Matt. 25: 46.)

THE SECOND PART.

OF MAN'S DELIVERANCE.

CHAPTER V.

God's Justice must be Satisfied—No mere Creature can Satisfy it—The Mediator must be very Man and also very God.

FROM what has been said in preceding chapters, it appears that man, in his unregenerate and unrepentant condition, is in a state of helpless misery. He cannot hope, by any means or inventions of his own, to escape from the deserved punishment of sin, or even to alleviate his wretchedness. On the contrary, he is like an ox struggling in the mire. All his unassisted

efforts to extricate himself sink him deeper into sin and suffering; so that he must learn by sad experience, that he cannot obtain deliverance. The futile attempts exhibited in all heathen religions furnish a continuous and abundant historical evidence, that "man by searching cannot find God." They have, as they always must, ended in the helpless cry for deliverance.

Still, notwithstanding the state of mankind is so desperate, viewed from the standpoint of sin, yet it must be said, to the praise and glory of God, that He has not left us to be crushed, by the burden of sin, into irretrievable ruin. He is our Father; and although we richly merit His displeasure, and deserve condign punishment, yet He has not visited us with the extreme penalty. He has "no pleasure in the death of the wicked," but like the father of the prodigal son, He yearns over sinners and stands with open arms to receive them into His favor (12). But not only so: He has made a way of access by which we may return, receive forgiveness, and be fully reinstated, and put in possession of our forfeited inheritance. But in infinite wisdom, He has not allowed His justice to be defeated. The salvation which He secured, embraced, along with our deliverance, the full satisfaction of His justice, and the vindication of His righteous Law. And this satisfaction was made, not independently of human nature, but in it, because human nature must, in the nature of the case, make the satisfaction required. For God could not, consistently with justice, punish any other creature for man's sin (14).—We cannot, of course, render the necessary satisfaction, as we have already learned, (13) because we are continually "increasing the debt" (Rom. 2: 5).

But God, seeing this defect in man, found "another" (12) who was "mighty to save" (Ps. 69: 4; 2 Cor. 5: 21; Rom. 8: 3, 4). But that "other" assumed human nature, and thereby met the conditions necessary. "No creature could sustain the burden of God's wrath against sin, so as to deliver others from it" (14). Hence, as sinful man could not save, and God's mercy would not punish another mere creature in his stead, the Mediator must be both man and God. He must be "very man

and perfectly righteous" (15), that He might be free from sin. He must be "very God," so as to be more powerful than all mere creatures, and thus be able, by His almighty power, to sustain His human nature under the weight of sin, and the burden of God's eternal wrath against it (1 Cor. 15: 21; Heb. 2: 14, and 17; Heb. 7: 26; Jer. 23: 6).

That our Deliverer must be both human and divine, in the constitution of His person, seems necessary for the following reasons:

A creature is necessarily finite and therefore limited, both in will and in powers of endurance. But even if one could be found, who was willing to undertake the task of bearing the burden of sin, he must either be destroyed or suffer forever. Hence it would require eternity in which to complete the satisfaction; and, therefore, it follows that the benefit, intended by His sacrifice for man, could never be applied.

This deliverance must come from a source that is not only perfectly righteous, but at the same time absolutely unlimited, or more "powerful than all creatures" (15).

The Mediator whom we must seek for, must be capable of representing God to men, and men to God. He must be on an equality with God, and yet come to God from the stand-point of human nature. Therefore He must be man, possessing all the original attributes of manhood, perfect and positively righteous, not only by nature, but also by His own voluntary act.

Only such an one could be acceptable to God. Only such an one can approach the throne of grace with any assurance of success. Only such an one has the right to expect the ear of God to be open to His cry.

But the same person, to be a successful Mediator, must be all powerful and irresistible. Or else man, who depends upon Him for salvation, can not rely on Him. He must be fully able to assure us that He can deliver us. It is, therefore, evident that He must be God, in all the goodness of His mercy, and in all the plenitude of His power.

Such a Mediator we can believe. Such an one we can trust with unwavering confidence. And such an one God can accept.

CHAPTER VI.

The Mediator—Must be God and Man—Is our Lord Jesus Christ.

It is very evident that our Redeemer must be "very man, and perfectly righteous," because "the justice of God requires that the same human nature which hath sinned, should likewise make satisfaction for sin" (16). "The soul that sinneth it shall die." This is in full accord with divine justice, and at the same time harmonizes with the true moral sense of mankind. Therefore God would not demand satisfaction from angels, or any possible intelligent creature, for the sake of mankind, which alone was guilty. And yet sinful men could not offer a sufficient atonement. For if one could satisfy for himself, it must be by suffering the whole penalty of the Law. But that would require the eternal ages. As all men are sinners, it is, therefore, easy to see that there could be no deliverance; for no one can satisfy for others' guilt, after having come under condemnation for his own sins. "Whosoever hath sinned against me, him will I blot out of my book" (Exod. 32: 33). (Confer Rom. 5: 15.)

The Deliverer must himself be perfectly righteous, and not under condemnation; so that it was impossible for any man, or for all men combined, to secure salvation. "For such an high priest became us, who is holy, harmless, undefiled, and separate from sinners, and made higher than the heavens, who needeth not daily, as those high priests, to offer up sacrifice, first for his own sins, and then for the people's." (Heb. 7: 26, 27; 1 Peter 3: 18; 2 Cor. 5: 21. Confer Isa. 53: 11, and Jer. 33: 15.)

Again, if a creature could be found free from sin, even he could not make the atonement, without being destroyed, unless he possessed more than human power and endurance. Indeed no power short of omnipotence could accomplish such a stupendous miracle. And therefore it follows that He who saves mankind "must be also very God" (17). The Man, in whom dwells all the fulness of the Godhead bodily, can, "by the power of His Godhead, sustain in His human nature the burden of God's

wrath." As "the wages of sin is death," He who saves sinners from their fate must die in their stead, and thereby bear their sins away, and clear them from guilt before God; thus obtaining "righteousness and life for them, and restoring it to them." Without restoration to righteousness no man can obtain life; but must remain "dead in trespasses and in sins," and in the end suffer the pains of eternal death.

It is to the glory of redeeming grace that God furnished a Mediator, who is, in His own person, divine and human, born a Mediator, capable of suffering for sins, dying on the cross, and, "by the power of an endless life, living again to assure us of eternal life." (Isa. 9: 6; Isa. 53: 4; Acts 2: 24; 2 Cor. 13: 4.) (Confer also Jer. 33: 16; Isa. 53: 5; 2 John 3: 16; Acts 20: 28, and 1 John 4: 9.)

Such a Mediator God gave us in the person of our Lord Jesus Christ, "who is in one person both very God and a real righteous man" (18). As Lord He is our Master and Ruler. As Jesus, He is our Saviour. As Christ, He is the Anointed of the Holy Ghost to be our Prophet, Priest and King, which will be more fully considered in future chapters.

That Jesus Christ is our Mediator, it is written, "There is one God and one Mediator between God and man—the man Christ Jesus." (1 Tim. 2: 5, 6; Matt. 1: 23; Isa. 7: 14; Luke 2: 11.) His divinity is also declared in many passages, as John 1: 1–5, and also John 1: 14, where it is written, "The Word was made flesh and dwelt among us." In this last passage we are to understand that the only-begotten Son of God took upon Himself human nature, for in fact such is the explanation of the Evangelist himself in the same verse. (Confer here Phil. 2: 7, 8).

Now this Divine-human Mediator, "of God is made unto us wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption" (18). 1 Cor. 1: 30; Col. 2: 3; 2 Cor. 5: 21; Rom. 10: 4; Eph. 1: 7; Heb. 10: 10).

As the eternal Word, revealing to us the knowledge of God and of our lost condition, and declaring to us the way of salva-

tion through Himself, He is called our "Wisdom." Restoring us to God, reconciling us to Him by His death, and thereby securing our justification and the divine declaration of our pardon, He is our "Righteousness."

"Born in us" by the Holy Ghost, "the hope of glory," He works in us, by His word and Spirit, a growing purity of heart, and an increasing holiness of life, and therefore He is called our "Sanctification." Again, as He gave His own life a ransom for us, thus paying the price of our deliverance, and opening a way of access to God for us, thus giving us assurance of acceptance and forgiveness, He is called our "Redemption." In Jesus Christ, therefore, as the God-man and Mediator between God and man, we have, by the infinite mercy of God, a complete and perfect salvation.

We come to know all this, not from intuition, nor from our unaided study of nature and divine things, but from the holy Gospel. That mere human reason could never invent or discover the truth of the Gospel is evident, because the great philosophers and students of nature, with all their scientific research, always find themselves groping in the dark, and blind leaders of the blind, when they attempt to discuss the moral and spiritual concerns of mankind, without the aid of divine revelation. Nature, indeed, is a revelation of God, but only in a material point of view. And accordingly it can furnish no light on spiritual things. The holy Gospel is our only source of reliable knowledge concerning our relation to God and spiritual things. The Gospel (good news—glad tidings), distinctively so-called, is found in the first four books of the New Testament. But it is also true that the Gospel is discoverable, more or less clearly, in all the books of the Bible. It is therefore proper to affirm that I know the plan of salvation "from the holy Gospel which God Himself revealed in Paradise" (19), where God, in addressing the serpent, said, "I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed: it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel" (Gen. 3: 15).

This promise was probably not fully understood when first spoken. It was intended to send a ray of hope into the sorrowing hearts of our first parents, and so far answered its immediate purpose in preserving them from despair. This appears to be indicated, when, at the birth of Cain, "the mother of all living" said, "I have gotten me a man from the Lord" (Gen. 4: 1), doubtless supposing that this was the seed that was to bruise the serpent's head.

But we now know that this first promise pointed, however dimly, to the coming of Christ, as the seed of the woman. It is probable that the "seed" includes the human race in its totality, as all are the descendants of the first pair; but it ultimately means the race, gathered up in the person of Christ, who, as second head, is the true "seed," representing the race, and who met the devil in deadly conflict. In the struggle, Jesus died; but He rose again from the dead, and by this victory of life over death, He destroyed the works of the devil (1 John 3: 8).

In securing the death of Jesus, the devil bruised His heel, and continues to do so by persecuting His followers; for what is done to them is done to Him (Matt. 25: 40). This beginning of the revelation of the Gospel was made by God Himself in Paradise before the expulsion of our first parents and the removal of the tree of life.

It was afterwards unfolded in the course of the ages, and made known more clearly and definitely to the holy Patriarchs. Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, each in his time, received the promise, that in his seed all the families of the earth should be blessed (Gen. 22: 18; 26: 4; 28: 14). And this seed is expressly declared to be the Christ (Gal. 3: 16). The promise in a different form was made to the tribe of Judah, which was to be the royal tribe of Israel, from which Christ actually came, as is shown by the tables of genealogy both in Matthew and in Luke. (Confer Gen. 49: 10.)

The Gospel thus promised to good men was repeated to their children from generation to generation, until the children of

Jacob became a nation, to whom were committed the oracles of God. After their settlement in the promised land, God raised up prophets unto them, who repeated the promises and received new revelations as God was pleased to give them. Thus the original Gospel was reiterated from age to age, with ever-increasing clearness and distinctness, and the hope of our first parents was kept alive. And the personal characteristics of the Messiah, and the nature of His mission and work, were described in prophetic language, with wonderful minuteness and accuracy and with ever-increasing clearness as the ages rolled on.

"All the prophets from Samuel, and those that followed after, as many as have spoken, have likewise foretold of these days" (Acts 23: 24. Confer John 5: 46; Rom. 1: 2, 3; Heb. 1: 1, with Acts 10: 43).

The same Gospel was published and represented in the form of object lessons, to the ancient people of God, "by the shadows of sacrifices and other ceremonies of the Law" (19). The offering of animals, according to the requirement of the Levitical Law, was called a sacrifice, because the animal was made sacred and set apart by a consecrating prayer, and then slain and consumed on the altar, as an offering and substitute for the sinner, whose life had been forfeited by sin. But, as the real effectual sacrifice for sin was made by Christ Himself, those legal offerings are, after all, only the shadows of sacrifices. But God was willing to accept them from sincere worshipers as a substitute, until the sacrifice of the Son of God could be made, on account of which man can receive the remission of sins; John 1: 29 (Acts 10: 43; 1 Cor. 5: 7; Gal. 4: 4; Col. 2: 17; Heb. 10: 1).

Thus, all the ceremonies of the Law, with their purifications, shadowed forth the sacrifice of Christ, whose blood alone could purify the hearts and consciences of men. And they served the purpose of types and adumbrations of the Lamb of God. Thus was published through them the glad tidings of salvation.

But in the end, all prophecies, publications and representa-

tions of the coming salvation reached their "accomplishment in the only-begotten Son of God" (19). All before Him was in the form of promise. But in Him the promises are fulfilled; and the light of the Gospel, like the sun in the East, arose out of the mist and gloom of the ages of type and shadow. And the Sun of Righteousness, the true light of the world, began to illuminate the spiritual sky, so that men might see, and rejoice in, the Gospel as the complete revelation of salvation in the person of Jesus Christ.

IV.

THE MINISTER'S POWER OF FORGIVING AND RETAINING SINS.

BY REV. WM. RUPP, D. D.

WHEN Jesus for the first time spoke of establishing a Church, He said to Peter, "I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven : and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven : and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven," Matt. 16 : 19. The same power of binding and loosing is afterwards promised to all the disciples alike, Matt. 18 : 18. And, accordingly, when Jesus had risen from the dead, and appeared for the first time in the midst of His assembled disciples, "He breathed on them, and said unto them, Receive ye the Holy Ghost : whose soever sins ye forgive, they are forgiven unto them ; and whose soever sins ye retain, they are retained," John 20 : 22, 23.

When the words recorded in this last passage were uttered, the process of human redemption had been completed in the person of Christ. His self-sanctification had been perfected in His death ; and the new spiritual creation, accomplished in His person, had been finished in His resurrection, by which He was "declared to be the Son of God in power, according to the Spirit of holiness." The way was, therefore, now open for the communication, through the Holy Spirit, of the power and life of the new creation to the world of sinful humanity which Jesus had come to save, and whose spiritual Head He had become ; and the occurrence described by St. John in the passage quoted above, may be regarded as the beginning of this communication of saving life from the Head to the members of a redeemed humanity.

During His previous ministry Jesus had prepared a number of chosen disciples to become the foundation of His Church. The body thus prepared by the personal ministry of Jesus was subsequently quickened and animated by the life of the glorified Christ, through the inspiration of the Holy Spirit on the day of Pentecost; and of that inspiration of the Spirit, which ultimately made the Church to be the body of Christ, the breathing upon the disciples by the risen Jesus on that first Easter evening may be regarded as the beginning and pledge. This breathing of Jesus upon the assembled disciples may be compared to the divine breath by which man is said to have originally become a living, rational being. "God formed man of the dust of the ground and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul." As the divine inspiration made man a rational, immortal soul, so the inspiration of Christ now makes of the chosen disciples new moral and spiritual beings. They are animated by a new spiritual or heavenly life—the life of the Second Man, "the Man of heaven;" and that makes them new moral and spiritual personalities, in whom the power of sin is broken, and the law of righteousness, and holiness, and love has become a vital energy.

But the power of the new creation, now accomplished in the souls of the disciples, is designed to be a continuous and ever-progressive power in humanity. As the leaven put into a quantity of meal acts until the whole mass is leavened, so the power of the new Christian life, which has now been lodged in humanity, though not as something separated from Christ, is designed to operate until the whole being of humanity shall have felt its regenerating and transforming efficacy. And this operation of the power of Christian life among men is ever bound to the body of Christian believers as its medium or element. In the created universe power of any kind requires an organ through which it may be exercised; and the organ which Christ has created for the exercise of His spiritual power in the world is His body, the Church. Those who have themselves felt the influence of the salutary grace of Christ

are to become instruments and means for the continuation of His saving work among men. The spiritual quality which has been imparted to them, they are in turn to impart to others. They are to serve, both collectively and individually, as organs of Christ for the taking away of the sin of the world, and for the establishment of the kingdom of God. The transformation of a sinful world into a world in which dwelleth righteousness—the conversion of a humanity that is carnal, depraved, sinful, into a humanity that shall be spiritual, pure, holy : this is the task of the Christian Church, and within the Church especially of the ministerial office. This we believe to be the fact or truth expressed in the words of the risen Jesus : “ Whosoever sins ye forgive, they are forgiven unto them ; and whosesoever sins ye retain, they are retained.”

These words, as is well known, have received very different interpretations from different commentators, and become the occasion of a vast amount of misunderstanding and abuse in the Christian world. While some have explained the promise which they contain as merely personal and temporal, and as having no significance for the Church beyond the time of the apostles, others have built upon these and similar expressions of Scripture a theory of the Christian ministry, which transforms the latter from a body of servants into an order of lords over God's heritage, such as is repugnant to the whole spirit of Christianity. In particular, the words of Jesus in the above passage have been interpreted to mean, that He was about to delegate to the apostles judicial and autonomic power to forgive or refuse to forgive sins—a power which they, so long as they should keep within the forms of their commission, might use according to their own pleasure, and which they might delegate to others after them to be used by them in like manner. The idea is that Christ created a distinct and self-perpetuating caste, consisting of the apostles and their successors, whom He clothed with His own authority ; so that, acting in due form, the acts of the ministry bind Christ Himself, and this too without regard to the moral nature or character of

these acts. The statement, "Whatsoever ye shall bind on earth, shall be bound in heaven," is taken to mean that the acts of a "legitimate" minister, that is, one of "apostolic succession," necessarily bind Christ Himself; in like manner as the acts of an ambassador bind his government, although they may not always be in harmony with its mind. As a government is bound to stand by the acts of an ambassador whom it has clothed with plenipotentiary authority to act in its name and on its behalf, so Christ is bound to stand by the acts of His vicar, without regard to the question whether these acts are exactly in agreement with His mind or not. The words and acts of the Christian minister thus acquire something of a magical character. Like the incantations and enchantment of the sorcerer, they accomplish results out of all relation to the law of causation.

The moral and religious consequences of this doctrine are well known. Men without grace in their hearts have imagined that they could arbitrarily dispense the grace of Christ. Priests with all the passions of unsanctified human nature, have imagined that they could dispose of men's destiny both in time and in eternity. They could open or shut the fountains of divine grace. They could put lands under interdict; they could shut up the spiritual heavens over whole countries, so that there might be neither rain nor dew of grace; and by their employment of the pains and penalties of spiritual power they could control the acts of governments and of nations. They believed that they held in their hands the fate of the living and of the dead. They could, at their own will, open and close the gates of heaven to the souls of men. They could declare men righteous or reprobate as they pleased. They could give men's bodies to the flames and consign their souls to the fires of hell. And many a time in history have crimes of the blackest dye been committed against the best and saintliest of the people of God, under pretense of this binding, this plenipotentiary power of the priesthood.

Such power God has not given unto men. Christ, indeed, as

the Son of Man, claimed and exercised power on earth to forgive sins. He said to the sick of the palsy: "Son, be of good cheer; thy sins are forgiven;" and He proved His power by healing the man's physical infirmity, and commanding him to take up his bed and walk. But Christ possessed this power because He was the Son of God, and because His will was always one with the will of the Father. "I and the Father are one," He says. And Christ never parted with this power to forgive sins on the earth. He did not abdicate His power when He said to His disciples, "All authority hath been given unto Me in heaven and on earth; go ye therefore and make disciples." And when He said to Peter, "I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven," He did not so part with the power of the keys that Peter and his successors afterwards could do with them what they pleased. In the Apocalyptic Epistle to the Church of Philadelphia, we read: "These things saith He that is holy, He that is true, He that hath the key of David, He that openeth, and none shall shut, and that shutteth, and none openeth." This "key of David" is nothing else than that spiritual power indicated by the expression, "keys of the kingdom of heaven," in the promise given to Peter. Christ holds that key in His own hands, and will not suffer it to be used for unjust and unholy purposes. Christ Himself is still the Lord in the kingdom of heaven; and He holds in His own hands the power of opening and shutting, the power of binding and loosing, or the power of forgiving and retaining sins.*

But this power of forgiving and retaining sins He exercises

* Cf. Trench, *Epistles to the Seven Churches in Asia*, pp. 231-2. "Christ teaches us here," says Trench, "that He has not so committed the keys of the kingdom of heaven, with the power of binding and loosing, to any other, His servants, here, but that He still retains the highest administration of them in His own hands. If at any time there is error in their binding and loosing, if they make sad the heart which He has not made sad, if they speak peace to the heart to which He has not spoken peace, then His judgment shall stand, and not theirs. . . . It was in the faith of this that Huss, when the greatest Council which Christendom had seen for a thousand years delivered his soul to Satan, did himself confidently commend it to the Lord Jesus Christ."

on earth now through earthly and human agencies. They who have experienced the absolving and spiritually cleansing power of the life of Christ in the Holy Spirit, are made to be the organs and instruments for the extension and application of the same power to others. Christ is the life of men; He is the source of salutary grace for the world; but they who believe on Him become, in their turn, fountains of spiritual life to those around them. "He that believeth on Me, as the Scripture has said, out of his belly shall flow rivers of living water." This we believe to be the profound truth expressed in the words of Jesus: "Whosoever sins ye forgive, they are forgiven unto them." And this is in agreement with the fundamental law of the moral world, that moral power can be exercised only through an agency that is of the same order or kind with that which it is intended to affect. The Son of God had to become man in order that He might effect the moral regeneration of humanity. And for the same reason that Christ had to be man in order to be man's Redeemer, He can now carry on His saving work, or His sin-forgiving, sin-removing work, among men only through human agency. The regenerating and sanctifying power of Christ does not work in humanity spontaneously, as a divine force works in the physical world; nor is its operation secured by any ministry of angels, who are not of a kindred nature with men; but only through the ministry of men, whose nature Christ assumed. In other words, the divine forgiveness of sin on earth is a moral process accomplished in humanity through the ministry of men: a *moral* process, we say, not a physical, or magical, or merely judicial process.

The idea of forgiving sin is not merely the notion of remitting its *penalty*. That, indeed, is the conception which many have of the forgiveness of sins. To forgive one a sin, according to this conception, is simply *not to impute its guilt*, or rather, *not to exact its penalty*. When the governor of a state pardons a criminal, he simply takes off, or remits, the penalty that has been imposed upon him; while such clemency may not at all affect the criminal's character or disposition. The criminal, after

having been pardoned, may remain exactly the same man that he was before. And after this manner the divine forgiveness is often regarded. Forgiveness is simply the non-indiction of the penalty which sin has deserved, and this without any change in the moral character of the sinner. People, accordingly, may continue to live in sin, and yet somehow enjoy the feeling that their sins will not hurt them. By some divine magic the penalty of sin may be warded off, while the sin itself may be cherished. This is said to be the divine plan of salvation; which is equally unethical, whether the divine indulgence be supposed to be based upon the payment of the penalty of sin by another, or whether it be supposed to be based upon the acceptance of a certain doctrine or truth on the part of the sinner. In any case forgiveness concerns only the penalty of sin, not sin itself.

But in the New Testament forgiveness of sin—or, rather, *sins*, for when connected with the notion of forgiveness the word is always in the plural, implying probably that responsibility and guilt are involved only in acts of conscious volition, and in the spiritual state or character resulting from such acts—forgiveness of sins, we say, in the New Testament, means the abolishment of sins by a change in the disposition or will from which they have sprung.* It is not merely the abrogation of

*The fact noted above that whenever, in the New Testament, sin is spoken of in connection with the idea of forgiveness, the word is in the *plural number*, could, of course, not be accidental. We have the same thing in the Apostles' Creed: "the forgiveness of *sins*." When sin is spoken of in connection with the atoning work of Christ, then the word is usually singular. Jesus is "the Lamb of God which taketh away the *sin* of the world." So it is also when sin is spoken of as a law or tendency of human nature. "I am carnal, sold under sin," says St. Paul. And again: "If what I would not that I do, it is no more I that do it, but *sin* that dwelleth in me." In these passages he could not have used the plural. But as an indwelling tendency which the individual has not given to itself and for which it is not responsible, *sin* is *not* *guilt*; it is misfortune or misery rather, and appeals to the divine compassion rather than to the divine wrath. While an evil to be overcome, it is nowhere in the New Testament represented as a cause of condemnation. The sinful tendency becomes guilt only when, through the will, it passes into action, and then settles into character. This requires forgiveness. But forgiveness implies repentance, or change of will or disposition—involving the whole moral constitution of the

guilt, or the remission of penalty, that is effected in divine forgiveness, but the moral transformation of the sinner. The words which in the Sacred Scriptures are used to denote the idea of forgiveness—like *nasa*, to take up and carry away; *salach*, to send away; *aphienai*, to send away from—all imply that sin is conceived as being removed from God's sight, as being totally done away or abolished. But sins can be done away in the judgment of God only if they are at the same time actually done away in the will or person of the sinner, that is, if the sinner be converted. The conversion of the sinner, then, is a result of that divine operation which we call forgiveness of sins. But this result cannot be accomplished merely by an omnipotent divine fiat, but only by divine grace acting with and through moral human mediation.

Moral character cannot be divinely created in a person. It could not be so created in the first man; and it cannot be so created in any one now. Every moral being must be the architect of its own character. What is given in creation is merely the potentiality of a moral personality, the actualization of which can only come to pass through the creature's own effort and action, under the sustaining and stimulating energy of the divine will. What is required, then, in order to the realization of a good or godly character, whether in a being newly created, or in a being abnormal and sinful, is not an invasion of its will by an immediate, omnipotent, divine power, but, on the one hand, a stimulation of it by external moral influence, and, on the

person; and this not as a previous condition, but as an effect rather of the divine forgiving grace, of course, an effect that is not involuntary, but voluntary. But while, in the process of conversion we must recognize a voluntary element, the will being stimulated by the apprehension in consciousness of the forgiving grace of God, we must also, on the other hand, recognize a sub-voluntary or sub-conscious element: "the law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus" working to free us "from the law of sin and death." On the distinction between sin as evil and sin as guilt, see Julius Kaftan, *Das Wesen der Christlichen Religion*, pp. 280-285. We think, however, that Kaftan makes the essence of the forgiveness of sin to consist too exclusively in the non-imputation of guilt. Forgiveness of sin is justification positively as well as negatively.

other hand, a quickening of it by an internal supply of moral energy from the absolute fountain of all moral goodness. And as Christ is the mediator of all divine goodness to men—the One through whom comes the love of the Father and the communion of the Holy Spirit—it follows that the new-creation, or regeneration, of a sinful soul can be brought to pass only by its coming into vital touch with the Spirit of Christ, so that moral power may go out from the latter into the former. This moral power of Christ, however, can gain admittance to the soul of the sinner only through the sinner's own moral activity. But in order to make room for such moral activity, the saving power must address the soul through external agencies and institutions, thereby stimulating without compelling the action of the will, at the same time that it approaches it through its own internal constitution. And this now we believe to be the meaning of the Christian ministry.

The ministry of the gospel is in its essence an agency for bringing the souls of sinners into touch with the Spirit of the glorified Christ. In this agency consists its power to forgive sins. Other power it possesses none. It cannot arbitrarily or magically undo for any one the consequences of his moral acts. It cannot absolve the impenitent. It cannot open the kingdom of heaven to the unbeliever, any more than it can close that kingdom against the believer. Nor can it, by the mere performance of a ceremonial act, or by the formal declaration of a gospel truth, change the moral nature or character of a soul.*

* What is called *absolution* in the cultus of the Church is not the pardoning of sin by the minister, but the declaration of God's mercy in Christ to those who repent and believe. It is not a creative, but a declarative act. But of what use is it, then, it may be asked; might it not as well be omitted from the service of the Church? We answer that it can be of use only as it may serve to produce faith and penitence in the minds of the worshipers. And this is its purpose. It was new moral life to the returning prodigal to hear his father pronounce the words of welcome which announced to him the pardon of his past sins; and so it may be new moral life to the sinner to hear from the lips of God's minister the declaration of the divine mercy, although there is in this declaration no magical power at all, and indeed no power whatsoever other than that which always goes along with the ordinary preach-

It can only serve as the organ of Christ through which He may exercise His saving power among men. It is in this capacity only, that is, as mediating the spiritual power of Christ, that the ministry can and does forgive sins. Primarily, indeed, this power belongs to the whole Church, the whole body of Christian believers; and every member of the Church should be a centre of Christian influence and power; and from his body should flow streams of living water to quicken and make glad the moral wastes of the earth. But to the Christian ministry, as the *official organs* of the spiritual life, which have been created by the Church, or rather by Christ through the Church, belongs in a special sense the function of mediating the power of Christ to the souls of men in order to their justification, and regeneration, and sanctification.* They forgive sins when they cause Christ to speak and act through them for the conversion of sinners, according to the purpose and intention of their office. God is in Christ, and Christ is in His minister, reconciling the world unto God; and this is remission of sins in the true Christian sense. We trust that no one will be shocked at our saying that Christ is in His minister. We mean this not in any physical or pantheistic, but in a spiritual and moral, sense. St. Paul was convinced that Christ was speaking in

ing of the gospel. On this subject, as some of the readers of this REVIEW will remember, there has been much blind controversy in time past, that has reflected no credit upon theology and theologians.

* The ministry is an *office* in the Church, not an *order* or *estate* above the Church. It is not before the Church, but results in consequence of a differentiation, according to time and circumstances, of the functions of the Church. The word *office* is derived either from *ob-facio*, to do something on account of another, or from *opi-facio*, to do work, to render service, and denotes a charge or duty conferred by public authority and performed for public benefit. Offices originate when the functions which belong to a body of people are formally transferred to chosen individuals and by them performed in behalf of the whole body. The ministry, then, is an office derived *immediately* from the Church. But as the Church is the creation of the Spirit and life of Christ, who is its ever-living and governing Head, it follows that ministers are not servants of the Church, but servants of Christ and ambassadors of God for the Church.

himself (2 Cor. 13 : 3); and we are sure that no Christian minister now will accomplish much in the way of making the world better unless he is able to entertain the same conviction.

And what, now, is it to *retain sins*? For the Lord speaks not only of forgiving, but also of retaining sins: He says, "Whose soever sins ye retain, they are retained." This surely does not mean to keep men in sin, or to keep them liable to the penalty of sin, by a wilful determination. It does not mean that a minister, or priest, may arbitrarily bind sins upon men at whom perhaps he may be offended, or that he may prevent their repentance, or that he may hinder God's mercy towards them. To retain sins is simply the negative of forgiving them: it is *not to forgive sins*, in the only sense in which that is possible for men; that is, it is not to discharge towards sinners the office by which repentance, and faith, and justification are conditioned. We retain men's sins when we do not labor that they may be forgiven. This expression, to *retain sins*, is one of those strong expressions which are numerous in Scripture, and in which there seems to be an extension of language beyond the intention of thought. When Jesus says, for instance, that one cannot be His disciple who "hateth not his own father, and mother, and wife, and brothers, and sisters," He surely does not mean to assert that, in order to be His follower, one must entertain toward his kindred so wicked a sentiment as *hatred*. The statement simply means that love to one's kindred must not be stronger than love to Christ, and must not stand in the way of the performance of one's duties in the kingdom of God. So, again, when the prophet says, in the name of Jehovah, "Jacob have I *loved*, Esau have I *hated*," this can mean no more than that the love which was given to Esau was not the same as that which was given to Jacob, though it was commensurate to the character of his personality. Certainly the passage could not mean that Esau was the object of a malicious feeling on the part of Jehovah. And so now, when to the Christian Church and to the Christian ministry there is attributed the power of *retaining sins*, this cannot

mean a grant of official power arbitrarily to bind sins upon men against their will; but it only means that the ministry may fail to exercise its moral and spiritual power in such way as to accomplish the conversion of sinners and the forgiveness of sins. We have a parallel to this passage in the words of Jesus recorded in Luke 6: 9. When the Scribes and the Pharisees watched Him whether He would heal a man's withered hand on the Sabbath, He asked them: "Is it lawful on the Sabbath to do good or to do harm, to save a life or to destroy it?" Here not to do good is to do evil, and not to save life is to destroy life. Doing good and saving life are so much of the essence of human duty, that failure in this is equivalent to the sin of cruelty itself. And so for ministers now to fail to be, in reality, co-workers with God in the destruction of sin and in the salvation of sinners, is in fact equivalent to retaining men's sins.

And this is something that is perfectly plain. It is a simple fact, about which there can be no mystery at all. Sin is not abolished and men are not saved where the gospel is not duly and effectively administered. The world is redeemed. Humanity has Christ in it, and that makes it a redeemed humanity. But men are not saved without the gospel, the ministry, the Church. The redemption of humanity is accomplished once for all in the life, and death, and resurrection of the Christ; but its actual salvation—the justification and sanctification of sinners—is accomplished only where the Word is preached, where the sacraments are administered, and where there is an exhibition of divine life in the persons of actual Christian men and women. In the heathen world, where the gospel is not proclaimed, there is no forgiveness of sins, no justification, no conversion. There is conscience in the heathen world, there is a feeling of guilt there, there is a shining of the light in the darkness there; and this is something good, for it proves that men are not wholly sundered from the source of light; but the darkness *comprehends* not the light, until there comes a messenger to bear witness of it and give it the force of personal authority and life. It is only by such witnessing to the light

that its illuminating and quickening power can be realized in the hearts of men. Those who are excluded from the effect of this witnessing of the light, whether by their own fault, or by the neglect or sin of others, are not saved. Their sins are not remitted, but retained.

We notice here a startling consequence of this Biblical conception of forgiving and retaining sins. We *retain* the sins of those to whom we fail to bring the gospel, when it is in our power to do so. Are we not, then, in some sense responsible for their sins? That is a solemn thought which no Christian, whether minister or common church-member, should lightly dismiss. The heathen to whom we might bring the gospel, and the masses of unevangelized men and women in our own land who are practically as much heathen as the dwellers on "Greenland's icy mountains" or "India's coral strand," are not saved; and they are not saved because we fail to be God's co-workers in their salvation. We pray, "Thy kingdom come;" but we fail to do our part in order to make it come, and so in effect we hinder its coming. We retain men's sins: not that we compel them to sin, or that we positively and purposely hold them in sin, but that we do not discharge towards them the office of remitting sins. It is true that there is doubtless in this matter of bringing the gospel to the nations something also of divine providence. It is not all of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth, but of God that hath mercy. There is a plan, a method, an economy, in the progress of the kingdom of God, which has fixed the times and seasons of their visitation. That Africa, for instance, has remained to the present moment the dark continent that it is, has been due not merely to the supineness and negligence of the Church, but also to the deadly influence of its climate. Indeed, when reading of the rapidity with which, in certain sections, the fatal climate of that continent has cut down the successive ranks of missionaries, one cannot, while admiring the heroism of those ever ready to fill up the gaps, suppress the suspicion that, in fixing upon those regions, "some one has blundered." Providence usually points the

direction in which the Church is to move so plainly that there ought to be no mistaking of its intention ; as we believe to be the case now in the Oriental world, as well as in Africa where the opening of the country through commercial enterprise seems to be a challenge especially to our colored brethren to become apostles to their own people. And when once the clock of destiny has struck the hour for the evangelization of any people, and we fail to respond to our duty, then we retain men's sins, and the responsibility will be ours. Here are applicable the Lord's solemn words to the prophet: "When I say unto the wicked, Thou shalt surely die, and thou givest not warning, nor speakest to warn the wicked from his wicked way, to save his life; the same wicked man shall die in his iniquity; but his blood will I require at thine hand." Ezek. 3: 18.

And so it is also when, by inconsistent conduct and by immoral lives, men hinder the effect of the gospel. This is possible in the case of ministers of the gospel and in the case of merely professing Christians. Of course, it will be admitted that a minister who does not practice what he preaches, will not accomplish much by his preaching. If his character is not in keeping with the doctrine of the gospel, then he will not commend the gospel much by his official ministrations, and his ministry generally will be fruitless. He will not then serve as an instrument for the remission, or annihilation, of sins among men, but rather as an occasion for their multiplication; and in the day of judgment he will have to answer for the abuse of his power and the neglect of his opportunities.

But the effect of the gospel may be hindered not only by the life and character of the preacher, but also by the life and example of the congregation. The congregation professes to be a community of Christian people. Its members are looked upon as exemplifying the doctrines and duties of Christianity. But if, now, the life and character of many of them be profane, if they fail to exhibit those virtues which the gospel prescribes and demands, then the effect must be to neutralize the influence of the gospel and to make void its power. The preacher says,

for instance, that men should love their neighbors as themselves. That is the royal law of the gospel, to which those who profess and call themselves Christians are expected to yield obedience. But if, now, while the preacher declares this to be the law of Christianity, there sits in the front pew, clothed in rich apparel, and presenting an air of self-satisfied composure, a millionaire who, by the selfish and cruel exploitation of his neighbors' toil, has coined their blood into money, then there will not be in that Church much of the power that works remission of sins, no matter how musically the absolution may be pronounced. It is in this way that the most earnest efforts of the most conscientious preacher may often be neutralized. The Church and the ministry are not separate and independent orders, so that the activity of the one could remain unaffected by the character of the other. The ministry is the organ of the Church, and its activity and influence must be determined largely by the character of the life that is behind it. This truth is expressed in the well-known proverb, "Like priest, like people," which would be equally true if the terms were reversed. The influence of the gospel in the early times of Christianity was due no less to the saintly lives of the new converts than to the eloquence and zeal of its preachers. When the heathen saw how the Christians loved each other, they beheld in this a proof of the claims of the new religion to be of supernatural origin and power.

It was doubtless because of this intimate connection between the life of the members of the Church and the effect of the ministration of the gospel, that St. Paul begged the Corinthians to give no offence in anything, that the ministry might not be blamed (2 Cor. 6: 3). Who will say how much of the apparent weakness of the gospel in our day may be due just to this kind of offence in the Church? It is said that the gospel has lost its power; sinners are no longer converted in large numbers; the churches are becoming empty; the masses are estranged; and all this is ascribed sometimes to the hardness of men's hearts, and more often to the progress of infidel science. Something may be due to both of these causes; but a great deal more, we

are convinced, is due to the waning of moral and spiritual power in the Church and ministry itself. We have no patience with that pessimistic theory which supposes that the power of the gospel is not adequate to the moral regeneration of the world, or that in the counsels of God it is not really intended that the world should be converted. We are well aware, of course, that the effect of the gospel depends not merely upon the faith and piety of its ministers, nor merely upon the will of God, but also upon the will of those who hear it. Men are free agents and may refuse to allow themselves to be affected by the power of the gospel. But we also hold, with Tertullian, that the human soul is naturally Christian, that is, predisposed to accept the gospel when this is presented to it in a form corresponding to its needs. God, we are sure, desires that all men should be saved. Only let the heart and the life of the Church be right—let the Christ be lived as well as preached by those who confess Him, and the gospel will continue to be, as it has always been, the power of God unto salvation, both to Jews and Greeks. The ministry may still have power to forgive sins, if it will only use it; but it must be spiritual and moral, not magical, power.

V.

THE RELATION OF ERASMUS TO THE REFORMATION OF THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY.

BY REV. J. W. SANTEE, D.D.

AN interesting work, entitled "*Life and Letters of Erasmus*," lectures delivered at Oxford, 1893 and 1894, by J. A. Froude, Regius Prof. of Modern History, over 400 pp., and published by Chas. Scribner's Sons, N. Y., was recently published; a book which it is a pleasure to read, being printed in the very best style of the art, and which throws an immense light on the period immediately preceding, as well as a part of the Reformation itself. The lectures are made up, to a great extent, of extracts from the letters of Erasmus, arranged in order, so as to allow him to speak for himself, and thus give a connected history of his life, showing the position he then occupied and the relation in which he stood to that vast upheaval known as the Reformation of the Sixteenth Century. It also shows how the civil and the religious forces were related and the contest for supremacy.

At this time, as long before, the religious world was controlled by the Pope at Rome, with his College of Cardinals, and without question, that form of government, for Society and the Church, was the best for that period known as the Middle Ages. Whatever may be said of Romanism, as it then existed, one thing is certain, the Romish Church saved society from the ruin which threatened, and saved, for future ages, the Scriptures, as well as other important works, which had a great bearing on the ages to come. What other power then in existence could have dealt with barbarian hordes which threatened

to destroy society, than the power exercised by the "man at Rome?" But what was suitable for that age was unsuitable for another. It will be an event when Vol. V. of Dr. Schaff's Church History, covering the period of the "Middle Ages," now in press, will appear, and which is expected to throw much light on what is strangely styled the "Dark Ages."

Erasmus occupies a position at the close of that period somewhat as forerunner, and, with others, assisted, by his writings, to lay down principles, to introduce light which finally resulted in the Reformation. It shows a strange conception of history to affirm, that the revolt was the work of the then actors. The preparation for the upheaval and the causes leading thereto can be traced far back of that period, as is ably done by Ullman in his "Reformers before the Reformation," and to these Erasmus belongs, standing at the close of that preparatory age, and on the threshold of what was to be ushered in. The period previous to the Reformation, that work itself and what followed, is intensely interesting, and without question will call for a revision—a restatement—by and by, so as to make it true history for the ages to come, giving to the actors their proper place and the praise or blame which they deserve. To do that these "Letters" in these lectures are a contribution and are leading the way and throw much light on that period of history. Upheavals like that of the sixteenth century are not the work of a day, but the forces producing them root far back into the past, and are often controlled by the caprices of men, and then turn history into channels causing misery in their train.

Erasmus was born at Rotterdam in 1466 or 1467, and lived in an age fraught with wonderful activity and life. The printing press of the Caxton's was being set up, which was to become the great lever to give light—to give to the world "the Word of life." About this time, also, the restless spirit of Columbus led him to undertake the discovery of unknown lands. The Netherlands, the land where the great battle of Protestantism was fought, and not in Germany, was beginning to rival Italy in commerce, art and learning. What a propitious age for this

newcomer at Rotterdam! Erasmus was a boy of wonderful talent, and when nine years old was placed in a school at Deventer, and when twelve years old, Dr. Schaff says, "he knew Horace and Terrence by heart." In this school, as "school-fellows, were several who were afterwards distinguished, especially Adrian of Utrecht, tutor of Charles V., Cardinal Regent of Spain, and eventually Pope." He had an insatiable thirst for learning, a fondness for books, an extraordinary memory, "was often severely flogged," and of whom Rudolph Agricola said, meeting him at school, "This little fellow will come to something by and by." "He was the most cultivated man of his age, and the admired leader of scholastic Europe from Germany to Italy and Spain, from England to Hungary . . . No man before or since acquired such undisputed sovereignty in the republic of letters." (Schaff.)

It will be interesting to follow Erasmus after the death of both mother and father, and how he was placed into a position preparatory to his future work. How touchingly he relates the way his guardians swindled him out of his property, tricks also repeated at the end of this nineteenth century. "He hated lies, and he never forgave an injury, and a fool to him was as much a criminal as a knave." He and another brother were left to the tender mercies "of a banker, a burgher, and the master of another school at Goude." After the guardians had spent their money, it was determined that these boys should be sent into a monastery, and, in all probability, Erasmus, especially, was entering a school where he was to be trained for future work. Into a monastery his guardians determined that Peter and he should go, and there be cared for. It seems they were placed, as a commencement, in a house of "collationary Fathers," and Erasmus gives his opinion, not mincing his words: "The world is full of these tricksters. When they hear of a lad of promise with wealthy parents they lay traps for him unknown to his relations. In reality they are no better than so many thieves, but they color their arts under the name of piety. They talk to the child himself of the workings of the Holy Spirit, of vo-

cations which parents must not interfere with, of the wiles of the devil: as if the devil was never to be found inside of a monastery" (p. 6). After spending two years both left, and all entreaties for him to take the irrevocable vows were useless, and he became somewhat of a wanderer, when at a time meeting an old friend, who gave a glowing account of the life he led, and, learning from his guardian that his account showed that he was a beggar, however, detesting, as he did, monkery, he finally agreed to "a step further and try the Noviciate." So he did. His thirst for knowledge remained and knew no bounds, but, unfortunately, among the monks intellect was not encouraged. But he was conscious of high talent. He says: "The officials might be good-natured, but they were illiterate blockheads . . . Lads of intellect were troublesome, and to be kept down. The thing wanted was a robust body, and tough fellows with strong stomachs found highest favor." "They were like vultures, stuff them full one day, they could hold out over the next." This kind of monastic life did not suit Erasmus, but, as he said, "the fish was in the net and in the net they meant to keep him." His inclinations were wholly averse to cloister life, and no wonder his health gave way under this unnatural strain. The condition of this unfortunate young man was noticed by the Prior of the convent, and through him he found favor with the Bishop of Cambray, who, by his influence with the Pope, succeeded in obtaining a "dispensation for temporary absence," of which he gladly availed himself. After a long period following, when Erasmus had shown himself hostile to the monks, and became a thorn in their side, the Augustinians tried to fasten the yoke on him as a former monk, but, appealing to the Pope for protection, he was successful, and the Pope granted his favor. Unpleasant as this schooling was to him, it was by no means lost. While here "he found that he might get drunk as often and openly as he pleased, but study was a forbidden indulgence. In a general way he discovered what the inner life of many of these institutions was—that many of them were no better than *lupanaria*." There is no

period in English history when you do not find corruption and irregularity, but in the fifteenth century the degradation had become universal. A spirit like that of Erasmus could not find any comfort inside of a monastery. "There are monasteries," he says, "where there is no discipline and which are worse than brothels; there are others where religion is nothing but ritual, and these are worse than the first, for the Spirit of God is not in them, and they are inflated with self-righteousness" (p. 174). In 1492 he was ordained priest at Utrecht; priest though he now was, his thirst for knowledge remained, and he ardently desired to see more of the world, and he made his way to Paris, "his fame, already acquired," preceding him. Fortunately for him, he had no taste for "vulgar dissipation." What he learned himself he taught to others, and Greek, a favorite language, and at that time a rare acquisition and frowned upon by the authorities, only led ardent students to seek it, and so in the elements of Greek he instructed pupils who came to him. One of the great troubles he had, because of the way of his living, was that of *finance*, but in Paris and elsewhere he found friends who relieved him when necessity pressed. By the solicitations of *Mountjoy* he came into England and was welcomed by distinguished friends, men of learning and renown, "where a growing thirst for knowledge existed, and where the long night of narrow ecclesiasticism was drawing to an end: the shell was bursting: the dawn was drawing on of a new age: the minds of men were demanding something deeper and truer than had satisfied preceding centuries." This was probably in December, 1497.

As you follow him while in England, reading his letters, it seems as if a new era was dawning. There, as elsewhere, society was much disordered. "A glance at the statutes of Henry VII. shows that violence during the long disorders had taken the place of law. The strong had oppressed the weak. With the accession of the Tudors, honest men in all ranks of society seem to have set themselves wisely to work to repair the mischief." "He speaks with astonishment of the conversations

which he heard at the tables of leading laymen, in contrast with the ribaldry of the monastic refectories." A restless spirit, such as he had, could not long be confined to one place, but while here he made the acquaintance of the best scholars of England, saw "Henry, who afterwards became Henry VIII., King of England, then a boy of nine." His desire was to return to Paris, and before his departure he wrote to Colet: "Theology is the mother of sciences, but, nowadays, the good and the wise keep clear of it, and leave the field to the dull and the sordid, who think themselves omniscient. . . . You are trying to bring back the Christianity of the Apostles, and clear away the thorns and briars with which it is overgrown; a noble undertaking." His pounds, which he obtained while in England, and which he had changed into French currency, were seized at the Dover Custom House, and "he was sent to Paris absolutely penniless." He became financially embarrassed, but without brooding over his misfortune, "he put together, with a few weeks' labor, a work which was to be the beginning of his world-wide fame." He called it "*Adagia*," a compilation from his common-place books, a collection of popular sayings, quotations, epigrams, proverbs, anecdotes; anything amusing which came to hand, with his own reflections attached to them." A few specimens: "A Greek proverb says, Androclides is a great man in times of confusion. This applies to theologians who make reputations by setting Christians quarreling, and would rather be notorious by doing harm than live quietly and not be noticed." "Priests (he observes) are said, in Scripture, to devour the sins of the people, and they find sins so hard of digestion, that they must have the best wine to wash them down." This work proved immensely popular, for edition followed edition, and assisted somewhat in replenishing his exchequer. But what was of more account, it gave him a wonderful reputation. With all that, he devoured all the books he could find. "He toiled harder at his Greek than ever, studied the Greek poets and philosophers, studied the Greek Christian fathers, translated Greek plays, translated Plutarch—Lucian—all under

enormous difficulties, for printed books were scarce and MSS. jealously guarded." He was anxious to visit Italy, but want of funds prevented. The plague breaking out, he fled to Orleans, and from there wrote: "I am writing a commentary on Jerome; I am working on Plato; I am comparing Greek MSS.; I am determined to master this Greek, and then to devote myself *arcanis literis*, which I burn to handle." From here he gave this good advice: "Read first the best books on the subject which you have in hand. Why learn what you will have to unlearn? Why overload your mind with too much food, or with poisonous food? The important thing for you, is not how much you know, but the quality of what you know. . . . Never work at night; it dulls the brain and hurts the health. Remember, above all things, that nothing passes away so rapidly as youth." To his mind, the whole scheme of Christianity had been overlaid by those who had been entrusted with it, and in "the exuberance of their power, the clergy seemed to exult in showing contempt of God and man by the licentiousness of their lives and the insolence of their dominion." But it was a dangerous undertaking to attack the then existing vices of the monks and the degraded condition of the monasteries, and yet preparations were going on to do that later on. "He had studied the New Testament—the early fathers. He could point the contrast between past and present. The New Testament to the mass of Christians was an unknown book. He could print and publish the Gospels and Epistles. He could ridicule as he pleased the theology and philosophy which had been sublimated into nonsense. With the New Testament he meant to publish the works of Jerome, because no one of the fathers gave so lively, so vivid a picture of the fourth century, and Jerome, though a monk and a panegyrist of monkdom, had seen clearly that, if it was a road to sanctity, it was a road also to the other place. These were the *arcanae literæ*, which he was burning, as he said, to go to work upon, and through all these years of trial he was preparing for his vast undertaking" (p. 67). He studies "Duns Scotus," and his "Angelical Doctor," and winds up a

long letter to his pupil Grey, thus: "Theology itself I reverence and always have revered. I am speaking merely of the theologastries of our own time, whose brains are the rottenest, intellects the dullest, doctrines the thorniest, manners the brutallest, life the foulest, speech the spitefulest, hearts the blackest, that I have ever encountered in the world" (p. 70). While in England he made intimate acquaintance with the best, most learned men; men as Colet, Fisher, More and others.

During these years of wandering he had been patiently laboring at his New Testament, and he was now to shine before Europe as a new star. "The Christian religion, as taught and practiced in Western Europe, consisted of the Mass and the Confessional, of elaborate ceremonials, rituals, processions; pilgrimages, prayers to the Virgin and the Saints, with dispensations and indulgences for laws broken or duties left undone." "Erasmus had undertaken to give the book to the whole world, that is the New Testament, to read for itself—the original Greek of the Epistles and Gospels, with a new Latin translation—to wake up the intelligence; to show that the words had a real sense, and were not mere sounds like the dronings of a barrel-organ" (p. 119). The appearance of this book, given to the people, gave them light and led them to assert freedom of conscience and personal rights. No wonder the monks became alarmed and began to storm at Erasmus. It is asserted, at times, that the Romish Church always sought to keep the laity in ignorance as to the Scriptures, but here is a Pope, in the person of Leo X., who approved of the undertaking of Erasmus. What an immense work this was! Dr. Schaff says, "Protestants should never forget the immense debt of gratitude which they owe to the first editor of the Greek Testament, who enabled Luther and Tyndale to make their translations of the word of life from the original, and to lead men to the very fountain of all that is most valuable and permanent in the Reformation." It was universally received, an indication that a reaction was commencing, like leaven, leavening the mass, and that society was preparing for a revolt. Erasmus had learned the condition of

the monasteries, he knew the character of the monks, had made himself acquainted with the theology of the times, and with his keen satire and skilfully wielded scalpel made the attack. When last in England, after spending some time with *More* at Rochester, he conceived what afterward appeared as "*Encomium Morie*" or "Praise of Folly"—this was about the same time his New Testament appeared. Of this we cannot speak, but the object evidently was "to turn the whole existing scheme of theology into ridicule, as little would he spare the theologians themselves, and, once off upon his humor, he poured arrow upon arrow." Dr. Schaff says, "The 'Praise of Folly' passed through seven editions in a few months and through at least twenty-seven editions during his life-time." "Of his 'Colloquies,' a bookseller in Paris printed twenty-four thousand copies."

These works of Erasmus excited not only the attention of the religious orders, but their rage and anger as well, and a new danger now confronted him, that was, being forced back into the religious order to which he first belonged and so brought into the hands and under the power of his bitter enemies, but in this he was equal to the emergency, and he threw himself on the protection of the successor of Julius II., and in a long letter to Lambert Grunnius, he pleaded his case, which brought the response, "He (the Pope) directs that your diploma shall be made out free of costs. I have given three ducats to the clerks and notaries to be quick with their work. You know what these fellows are—you must fling a sop or two to Cerberus. Farewell." Erasmus was now, with his diploma from the Pope, a *free man*.

With all the vast labor he had been doing, he was editing Jerome, which was about to appear, published at Bâle, by Froben, and was to be dedicated to the Pope. How the light began to shine by means of these books! The eyes of the people were gradually opening, they began to see the corruptions, the impositions practiced on them, and also to understand, to some degree, the character of monks and priests. It was now a fight

between learning and ignorance, between light and darkness. It seems that the monasteries were arrayed against light, enemies of Greek, and consequently an attack was made on another important friend of learning in the person of *Reuchlin*, both a Hebrew and Greek scholar, and who introduced the study of these languages into Germany and it is said "that he was the father of modern Bible criticism." Enraged as the monks were at Erasmus, but who had the protection of the Pope and the Emperor, they next attacked Reuchlin and succeeded in having him suspended and imprisoned, and he stood in great danger of going to the stake. Erasmus, now free, stood forth in defense of this man of learning. In 1517, Erasmus wrote to his friend Pirkheimer, "I am busy with a new edition of my New Testament. . . . I am making a fresh book of it. I am delighted that you have stood up for Reuchlin. Poor Reuchlin! What a fight he is having and with what enemies! The Pope himself is afraid to provoke the monks. Alexander VI. used to say, that it was less dangerous to provoke the most powerful prince of Europe than offend the meanest of the mendicant friars. Those wretches in the disguise of poverty are the tyrants of the Christian world," etc. (p. 183). How rapidly these various tendencies were developing and what a revolution they were preparing, which was soon to burst upon the world! Here was the New Testament with the Pope's sanction before the world; Jerome, also, with the Pope's name on the title page. How promising and bright now the intellectual and theological horizon! Was the golden age dawning? In a letter to Fabricio Capito, he says: "We have Leo X. for Pope; a French King, content to make peace for the sake of religion when he had means to continue the war; a Maximilian for Emperor, old and eager for peace; Henry VIII., King of England, also on the side of peace; the Archduke Charles, '*divinæ cujusdam indolis adolescens*.' Learning is springing up all around out of the soil; languages, physics, mathematics, each department thriving. Even theology is showing signs of improvement. Theology, so far, has been cultivated only by

avowed enemies of knowledge. . . . All looks brighter now. Three languages are publicly taught in the schools. . . . I do not want the popular theology to be abolished. I want it enriched and enlarged from earlier sources. When the theologians know more of Holy Scripture they will find their consequence undiminished, perhaps increased. All promises well, so far as I see" (pp. 186, 187). The lecturer adds, "Reform was in the air—reform or some more dangerous change. What Erasmus wished, what Leo and the cardinals wished, what Warham and More and Colet and Fisher wished in England is tolerably clear. They saw popular Christianity degraded into a superstition; the clergy loose and ignorant; practical religion a blind idolatry; the laity the victims of the mendicant friars, who enslaved them through the confessional; theology a body of dogmatic propositions developed into an unintelligible scholasticism, without practical bearing upon life. Wise men desired to see superstition corrected, the Scriptures made the rule of faith and practice, the friars brought to their bearings and perhaps suppressed, the clergy generally disciplined and educated. They had no wish to touch the church or diminish its splendors. The church was, or might be, a magnificent instrument of human cultivation and might grow with the expansion of knowledge." Would these earnest desires be realized? Were these reformers not working for that? In that view the position of Erasmus becomes clear. But reformations, such as were needed at that period, are not the work of a day. Men, like À Kempis, were prophets of a better age, but society, the intellectual, the moral and the spiritual, had first to be prepared. And it took such a system under which Erasmus was born, lived and wrought to discipline and prepare the way. A stern schoolmaster, indeed!

It will not be necessary to follow Erasmus through the trials which awaited him. His books were submitted to the divines at Louvain to be examined, and as he says, "how near he came to be burnt," but as "admiration swelled on one side, fury was as loud upon the other." "He had deliberately stirred a nest

of hornets, and he smarted under the inevitable sting." However, he writes: "You will soon see a new age among us. The paraphrases are universally praised, and it is something to have written a book of which that can be said." We come now to the year 1517. By this time "the writings of Erasmus were flying over Catholic Christendom, and were devoured by every one who could read. The laity, waking from the ignorance of ages, were opening their eyes to the absurdities and corruptions of irresponsible ecclesiasticism. . . . Some vast change, as Erasmus saw, was immediately imminent. He expected, and he was entitled to expect, by the favor which had been shown to himself, that it would take the shape of an orderly reform, carried out by the heads of the Church themselves and the princes who were then on the various thrones of Europe. Every sign seemed favorable to such an issue. . . . Europe was at last at peace. The princes were all friends. It was an opportunity which might seem created specially by Providence, and to this forfeited chance Goethe alluded sadly when he said, that the intelligent progress of mankind had been thrown back for centuries, when the passions of the multitude were called on to decide questions which ought to have been left to the thinkers." How sadly true that judgment!

Now another and an altogether different actor appears on the stage. The public mind, in the condition it was in, was prepared for almost anything. To a Saxon miner was born a son who was to play an important part in making the coming history. Every reader is acquainted with the early life of Martin Luther. Like Erasmus he made his way to Rome as a faithful and obedient son of the Church, but was much disappointed in not finding what his ardent hopes had expected. He saw Rome through eyes different from those of Erasmus, and after his return he witnessed transactions in the name of religion which he believed to be wrong, and which induced him to take a bold stand in opposition thereto. Such abuses he wished to be reformed, corrected or entirely abolished. On the 19th of November, 1517, he nailed the 95 theses to the

door of the church at Wittenberg, attacking the long-continued abuses. Here now was an open, bold challenge. Would the monks have the courage to grapple with this new enemy? Did not this attempt, this challenge, aim at the correction of abuses then prevalent in the Church, and was it not spoken of and remonstrated against before this? By means of these theses a furious storm was aroused. Was the Church prepared to guide and direct the storm, or to suppress it? In vain did the ecclesiastics rage; the common people, influenced by the revival of learning, through the labors of Erasmus, who gave them the New Testament, already in several editions, also his edition of Jerome, as well as his other writings, showing the monks in their true character, the condition of the clergy, generally, the need for reformation, and with such light as they had the common people naturally took sides with Luther. Was the demand that the attack of Luther on indulgences should be answered an unreasonable one? That the monasteries should be reformed, the condition of the clergy be improved? Erasmus did not know Luther, but he befriended him in so far as to say, that instead of suppressing and silencing him, his writings should be answered. That was his position over the stormy period following. Erasmus was a friend of the Pope, a member of the Romish Church, was anxious to remain and continue such, even in the face of the urgent necessity for reform and correction of abuses. The principles which these theses attacked had been laid bare and exposed by Erasmus before Luther nailed them to the door of the church, and, to the enlightened mind, it was no new attack. Luther openly challenged a refutation. The dream of Erasmus "was a return to early Christianity,—a Christianity of practice, not of opinion, where the Church itself might consent to leave the intellect free to think as it pleased on the inscrutable mysteries. In Luther he saw the same disposition to dogmatic assertion at the opposite pole of thought; an intolerance of denial as dangerous as the churchman's intolerance of affirmation. . . . If Luther's spirit spread, dogma would be met with dogma, each calling

itself the truth: reason could never end disputes which did not originate in reason, but originated in bigotry or a too eager imagination. . . . Declare for Luther he would not. He could not commit himself to a movement which he could not control, and which, for all he could see, might become an unguided insurrection. . . . How well Erasmus judged, two centuries of religious wars were to tell. The wheel has come round at last." (206, 207.) For all the trouble Erasmus was blamed. True, the people had his New Testament, read his "Praise of Folly"—his Jerome, and in proportion as these were read and studied light began to dawn. But nearer and nearer the storm was coming, and he ventures this caution: "I have admonished them (friends of Luther) to be more cautious. I have advised them to keep their pens off popes, and cardinals and bishops, who are their only protectors. I can control my own style. I cannot govern theirs." Surely Erasmus was in earnest as to reform, but shuddered at the very thought of schism. He desired a reform in the Church itself without violence.

The two men, Erasmus and Luther, were of different temperaments. Prof. Nevin, in the *History of English Literature*, p. 188, says: "But the temper of the Renaissance was even more antagonistic to the temper of Luther than that of Rome itself. From the golden dream of a new age, wrought peaceably and purely by the slow process of intelligence, the growth of letters, the development of human virtue, the Reformer of Wittenberg turned away with horror. He had little or no sympathy with the new culture. He despised reason as heartily as any papal dogmatist could despise it. He hated the very thought of toleration or comprehension. He had been driven by a moral and intellectual compulsion, to declare the Roman system a false one; but it was only to replace it by another system of doctrine as elaborate, and proclaiming the same infallibility. To degrade human nature was to attack the very base of the new learning, and his attack on it called the foremost of its leaders into the field. But Erasmus no sooner advanced to

the defence, than Luther declared man to be utterly enslaved by original sin, and incapable through any efforts of his own of discovering truth or arriving at goodness." Such a doctrine not only annihilated the piety and wisdom of the classic past, from which the new learning had drawn its larger views of life and of the world; it trampled to the dust reason itself, the very instrument by which More and Erasmus hoped to regenerate both knowledge and religion." And yet the Church was to be reformed! Various attempts were made to allay the elements composing this storm, but it came sweeping irresistibly along, and Erasmus was compelled to say, "that the whole business was mismanaged." The course taken by Rome was not calculated to settle the unsettled. Instead of answering Luther, who had "not meant to raise such a tempest," a "papal Bull came out, formally approving the indulgences, condemning Luther's action, which, Erasmus says, every right-minded man in Germany approved, ordering his books to be burnt, and commanding his arrest and punishment" (p. 215). Louder and louder the storm raged; Luther ventured to write to Erasmus, and "thought that he should stand as his friend." "Luther was to him merely an honest and perhaps imprudent monk, who had broken out single-handed into a noisy revolt, . . . but the beginners of revolutions are not those who usually bring them to a successful conclusion." He ventures this advice to Luther (p. 234): ". . . but generally, I think courtesy to opponents is more effective than violence. Paul abolished the Jewish law by making it into an allegory; and it might be wiser of you to denounce those who misuse the Pope's authority, than to censure the Pope himself; so also with kings and princes. Old institutions cannot be rooted up in an instant. Quiet argument may do more than wholesale condemnation. Avoid all appearance of sedition. Keep cool. Do not get angry. Do not hate anybody. Do not be excited over the noise which you have made. . . . Christ give you His Spirit for His own glory and the world's good." "He had perceived that theology had grown thorny and frigid; the early

Fathers were neglected, and he had merely tried to recall men to the original fountain of the faith. The signs in the sky were ugly and portended a schism. . . . Were St. Paul Pope, he would part with some of his wealth—yes, and some of his authority, too, if he could restore peace to the Church.” To the Bishop of Rochester, he wrote, among other things: “Still I am sorry that Luther’s books have been published. I tried to prevent it, as I thought they would cause disturbance. He wrote me a very Christian letter. I replied by advising him to avoid saying anything seditious, not to attack the Pope, or fly in a passion with anybody, but to teach the Gospel calmly and coolly.” But the struggle was here, the contest at hand. The eyes of the Elector were turned to Erasmus, and in consultation with him, Erasmus told the Elector, “that Luther had committed two unpardonable crimes—he had touched the Pope on the crown and the monks in the belly.” Even Melancthon went to him for advice. “At Louvain, every one speaks well of Luther. There are differences about his doctrines. I can give no opinion, for I have not yet read his books. He seems to have said some things well. I wish his manner had been as happy as his matter. I have written about him to the Elector of Saxony.” To Louis Marlianus: “Christ I know; Luther I know not. The Roman Church I know, and death will not part me from it till the Church departs from Christ. I abhor sedition. Would that Luther and the Germans abhorred it equally. . . . Even now I would prefer that things should be quietly considered and not embittered by platform railing. I would have the Church purified of evil, lest the good in it suffer by connection with what is indefensible; but, in avoiding the Scylla of Luther, I would have us also avoid Charybdis.” One blow followed the other. The next attack was made on the more sacred order of the Church and the papacy as an “anti-Christian usurpation.” In the face of such violence, all efforts at reconciliation were unavailing. No storm can be argued out of the way or arrested in its course by angry declamation, and, accordingly, the Pope was induced “to issue

a Bull, defending the indulgences, condemning Luther's writings, and ordering every priest in Germany to preach against them." A Diet was summoned to meet at Worms in the following January. To George Spalatin, he writes, July 6, 1520: "May Christ direct Luther's actions to God's glory, and confound those who are seeking their own interests. In Luther's enemies, I perceive more of the spirit of this world than of the Spirit of God. I wish Luther himself would be quiet for a while. He injures learning and does himself no good, while morals and manners grow worse and worse." To Gerard, of Minigen, he wrote: ". . . I might have had a bishopric if I would have written against Luther. I refused and stood neutral. But the end, I fear, will be that evangelical truth will be overthrown. We are to be driven, not taught, or taught doctrines alike against Scripture and against reason." How passion was left to play! "The Vatican officials have burnt his (Luther's) own books: he himself replied with burning the Pope's Bull, with a copy of the Decretals, and so defied Leo to do his worst." On January 28, 1521, he wrote to one whom he calls N——: "The world is splitting into factions. . . . My work has been to restore a buried literature and recall divines from their hair-splittings to a knowledge of the New Testament. . . . The matter now in hand can be arranged if the Pope, the princes, and your Highness, will refer it to a small number of learned good men." Again, to Nicholas Berald: ". . . All know that the Church has been tyrannical and corrupt, and many have been busy thinking how it can be reformed. But medicines wrongly applied make the patient worse, and when attempts are made and fail, the symptoms only grow more dangerous. Would that Luther had held his peace, or had gone to work more discreetly. I care nothing for the fate which may overtake him, but I do care for the cause of Christ, and I see churchmen in such a temper, that, if they triumph, farewell to Gospel truth." To Archbishop Warham, August 24: "The condition of things is extremely dangerous. . . . Luther has been sent into the

world by the genius of discord. Every corner of it has been disturbed by him. All admit that the corruptions of the Church required a drastic medicine. . . . Luther's movement was not connected with learning, but it has brought learning into ill-repute, and the lean and barren dogmatists, who used to be my enemies, have now fastened on Luther like the Greeks on Hector." Why did Erasmus keep aloof from Luther? Was it because he saw that he was constructing a "new Protestant theology, which might be as intolerant and dangerous as the Catholic," and therefore would not commit himself to him?

"They call me a Lutheran. Had I but held out a little finger to Luther, Germany would have seen what I could do. But I would rather die ten times over than make a schism. I have acted honestly throughout. Germany knows it now, and I will make all men know it" (304). His advice to the Pope, "For myself I should say, discover the roots of the disease. Clean out those to begin with. Punish no one. Let what has taken place be regarded as a chastisement sent by Providence, and grant a universal amnesty. . . . The magistrates may prevent revolutionary violence. . . . Then let the world know and see that you mean in earnest to reform the abuses which are justly cried out against, and if your Holiness desires to know what the roots are to which I refer, send persons whom you can trust to every part of Latin Christendom. Let them consult the wisest men that they can find in the different countries, and you will soon know" (312). How true these words of Erasmus to a friend. . . . "Can these new gossellers have no patience with men, who cling to doctrines sanctioned by ages and taught by popes and councils and saints, and cannot gulp down the new wine? Suppose them right. Suppose all that they say is true. Let them do Christ's work in Christ's Spirit and then I may try if I can help them." Urgent requests came from every side, for Erasmus to write or do something to allay or settle the trouble. He purposely kept aloof from Luther, he feared "the construction of a new dog-

matic theology, of which the denial of the freedom of the human will was the corner-stone." Forced at last to take up his pen to write, he chose that for his subject, viz., "The freedom of the will." "The book produced no effect further than as it was a public intimation that Erasmus did not agree with Luther." The lecturer sums up Luther's theory thus: "It is the same as that which philosophers like Spinoza and Schopenhauer arrive at by another road. It contradicts superficial experience, as the astronomic explanation of the movements of the stars appears to contradict the evidence of our senses; but is perhaps the most consistent at bottom with the actual facts which we observe" (324). "Now follow replies and counter-replies. Erasmus was anxious for peace, and for this he was strenuously working, corresponding with the Emperor, the Chancellor, the King of France, the German princes, Catholic bishops and reforming divines, working, too, all the time with superhuman industry at his special work of editing the Fathers" (326). In many of his letters he repeats what he had before affirmed—the corruptions and abuses in the Church, the immorality of monasteries and monks and the need for reform, but, with all that, he could not endorse the imprudent course of Luther, attacking not only monks and monasteries, but the Pope himself. He was equally dissatisfied with the vacillating policy of Rome, and the efforts which had been made to bring about peace. While all this was going on, Luther stormed "and scornfully advised Erasmus to remain a spectator in a game for which he lacked courage to play a manly part." Was it not saying, "Come with me, see my zeal for the Lord;" but Erasmus did not see it in that light, and he writes: "The conflict was raging between the muses and their enemies, when up sprang Luther, and the object thenceforward was to entangle the friends of literature in the Lutheran business so as to destroy both them and him together." To Archbishop Warham he writes: "Revolution is in the air. I fear bloodshed, for the roots have gone deep. No one who has not seen Germany can believe in what condition we are. . . . At Rome all is confu-

sion." Again, "Luther amazes me. If the spirit, which is in him, be an evil one, no more fatal monster was ever born. If it be a good spirit, much of the fruit of the gospel is wanting in him. If a mixed one, how can two spirits so strong exist in the same person?"

With all the efforts made to restore order and peace, there was no peace. "Charles summoned a Diet to meet at Augsburg to 'take into consideration the condition of the country.' Both sides had armed and were prepared to fight if the Diet failed." Erasmus could not be present, but he said, "Unless I am far mistaken there will be blood shed in Germany." "While the Diet was still sitting an edict was announced, commanding the restoration of the Catholic services through Germany, the restoration of the church property, and the reversal of all that had been done." Unfortunate edict! Refusal followed. "The Emperor called the Lutherans a sect, and commanded the cities which had adopted the new opinions to conform within six months." "I do not like the look of things. God knows what is coming." "Never was so wild an age as ours: one would think six hundred Furies had broken loose from hell. Laity and clergy are all mad together." From these letters it may be seen how rapidly the clouds, so threatening, were gathering, when finally they broke, and thus he wrote: "See what the world is coming to—rapine, murder, plague, famine, rebellion. No one trying to mend his own life. What can be before us but the deluge?" New sects arose amidst this confusion, and who was able to stem the raging torrent? No edicts could do so, but only added fuel to the flames. Instead of turning attention to correcting abuses the opposition became the more embittered and determined. The storm had to break, and break it did.

In this entire reformation trouble the position of Erasmus is one of nobleness, the earnest desire of elevating society, leading it to intellectual feasts, cultivating learning and science, but above all to a pure faith, an earnest, personal, practical Christianity. He sought this within the bosom of the Church, for

there had been before, and were then, earnest, pious, God-fearing men in that communion, as witness A'Kempis, Tauler and hosts of others. Had the advice of Erasmus which the Pope and secular rulers sought from him been taken, the Reformation, which had to come, would have taken a different course. Had Luther taken his advice, instead of asking him to be "only a spectator," had he been more moderate, less self-willed; had he been more obedient to authority, less conceited; had he been more cool and deliberate and considered the fearful consequences toward which he was pushing this work, with so little judgment, the Reformation, so rapidly coming, would have taken a different direction. Instead of a Reformation within the bosom of the Church, which Erasmus desired and worked for, the world saw a schism, and our Protestantism became a divided interest. Is it not after all sect and schism since, as history declares? In our divided, distracted condition we try to find comfort by referring to the different phases of religious Christian life, and say to a conscience somewhat uneasy and troubled because of this confusion, "Thou art all fair, my love: there is no spot in thee." The fact that there is so much said about Union in our day; that there is the want of an earnest, strong faith in *the fact*—the article of faith in the creed—*the Holy Catholic Church*; that with many now this article has dwindled into the notion of a mere society, an association like the orders of the day, is strong evidence that something is wanting—something wrong.

But this problem was not only before the mind of Germany, the same spirit of rebellion, opposing authority prevailed in England, as Erasmus once said, "The trouble was felt throughout the entire church." King Henry VIII. stood out nobly for the Church, but when he could no longer have his way, when the Pope and the word of a woman opposed his schemes and stood in his way, it was then he broke with Rome. That carried the best men in the realm to the scaffold and the stake. Erasmus bewailed their fate, and the result was another schism, and now we have what is known as the "Church of England."

How Erasmus labored to prevent all this, how keenly he suffered from his enemies, when he tried to spread light, intelligence and sanctified learning, and then see the storm sweeping over what should have been the fairest order from heaven, and in spirit, looking into the future, seemed to see the years of trouble, blood and carnage following, no wonder this man of peace, this man of God, was weary of life, and he closed a most eventful and weary one, dying quietly at Bale, July 12, 1536, and was buried in state in the Cathedral. He was a fruitful writer and editor, and, though dead, still speaks.

VI.

ON THE ORIGIN OF DEATH.

BY RICHARD C. SCHIEDT.

At the very outset of this discussion I should like to have it understood that it is not intended to either aid or create any controversy on a subject which has so profoundly stirred the minds of the modern theological world. I am satisfied with stating a few incontrovertible facts brought to light by recent investigations in the sphere of organic evolution, which seem calculated to lead to a better understanding of the dissolution of corporeity commonly called death. The theory of organic evolution is not by any means more than its name implies, viz.: a good working theory by the application of which the origin and succession of life by evolution may now be demonstrated in every branch of Biology, including palæontology, embryology and morphology. However, the theory of the evolutionary process is inseparably connected with some theory of inheritance. Lamarck, who by the publication of his "*Philosophie Zoologique*" in 1801, became the father of the "theory of descent," did not study heredity as a special problem in itself, but he boldly postulated his theory of "direct adaptation," which best fitted his views of evolution. Darwin likewise laid but little stress upon the heredity problem, and only after he had modified his views of the omnipotency of "natural selection," did he begin to feel the absolute necessity for a working hypothesis of inheritance. At the present time heredity is the chief problem of biologists, since the whole accepted theory of the process of evolution has been shaken to its very foundations by a brilliant student of heredity; and no one at present has so

great a following or is exerting such a wide influence as Professor Weissmann, of Freiburg. He approached the heredity problem purely from the embryological side: "How is it that a single cell of the body can contain within itself all the hereditary tendencies of the whole organism?" Lamarck, Darwin, Galton, Spencer, Brooks and others reached the problem chiefly through the study of living adults in past and present time, Weissmann from the side of embryogenesis. The latter's predecessors answered the above question by maintaining that the substance of the germ-cells is derived from the body of the new individual, granules from all the different cells of the body aggregating in the generative glands; Weissmann demonstrated that it is directly derived from the germ-cell. According to his theory of the "continuity of the germ-plasm," the germ-cells of the parents must give rise to "somatic" cells, forming the body of the offspring, and to "germ" cells. Furthermore, no special or local life-changes in the body can in any way reach or influence the germ-cells in such a manner as to be inherited.* From this it at once becomes evident how the repetition-phenomena in the offspring must be accounted for, while the non-repetitive phenomena or variations remain practically unexplained, phenomena which in palæontology furnish the most powerful proofs for the theory of evolution. However, it does not fall within the scope of this paper to enter upon a criticism of the shortcomings of Weissmann's views; suffice it to say that the discussion of our theme is closely related to the great biologist's embryogenetic factor in evolution. According to his theory the individuals are mere offshoots from the continuous germ-plasm stem, which in itself must, in a certain sense, be immortal; i. e., his claim is not that the germ-plasm must, under any circumstances, exist forever, but it will exist as long as the proper physical conditions exist; in other words, that death is not inherent in life.

*"In each development a portion of the specific germ-plasma which the parental ovum contains is not used up in the formation of the offspring, but is reserved unchanged to form the germ-cells of the following generation."

Weissmann's brilliant exposition of heredity is, however, not entirely new; it is the culmination of a train of thought which was broached long ago by Ehrenberg, in his treatises on Protozoan life. These firstlings among the inhabitants of our globe are physiologically complete in themselves, and have, at least, very great, if not unlimited, powers of self-recuperation. They leave off where higher animal life begins, that is to say, in a unicellular state. They do not form bodies. They resemble, therefore, the individual reproduction-cells of multicellular beings, with this difference, however, that their reproduction is, in the majority, simple cell-division into two, each part becoming a new independent individual. The mother Protozoan does not die during this process, for there is no corpse, but the whole animal, as such, has completely disappeared, and in its place we find two individuals, which are not parent and offspring, but rather twins. They are both young animals, for they increase in size, and when fully grown divide again into two new young ones, and so on indefinitely; they may, therefore, be said to be potentially immortal, in the sense as above defined. Weissmann was the first one to develop this knowledge into a scientific theory. He compared the life-cycle of a Protozoan to the circulation of water which evaporates, gathers in clouds and falls to the earth, only to evaporate again. There is no inherent cause in the physical and chemical properties of water which will bring this cycle to an end. As long as the present physical conditions exist the cycle must continue. So it is with the life-cycle of a Protozoan, *i. e.*, division, growth by assimilation, division again—and so on without end. In Weissmann's own words: "Natural death occurs only among multicellular organisms; the single-celled forms escape it. There is no end to their development which can be likened to death, nor is the rise of the new individuals associated with the death of the old. In the division the two portions are equal; neither is the older or the younger. Thus there arises an unending series of individuals, each as old as the species itself, each with the power of living on indefinitely; ever dividing,

but never dying." Ray Lankester puts the matter tersely when he says: "It results from the constitution of the protozoan body as a single cell, and its method of multiplication by fission, that death has no place as a natural recurrent phenomenon among these organisms." This does not mean, of course, that they are exempt from any violent fate, *e. g.*, starvation, or disease, or being crushed. These are, however, rather accidental than natural deaths. Besides, in relation to environment, their simplicity gives them a peculiar power of avoiding impending destiny. The habit of forming protective cysts is very general, and thus enwrapped, they can, like the ova and a few of the adults of some higher animals, endure desiccation with successful patience, rewarded by a rejuvenescence when the rain revisits the pools. But the doctrine of the immortality of the Protozoa refers to a defiance of natural, not violent, death.

Since Weismann made this startling assertion that death is not an attribute of all living organisms, much opposing evidence has been brought forward. Maupas, of Algiers, made a series of experiments with a number of species of infusoria, observing, under the proper conditions of temperature, moisture and food, that after the production of from fifty to one hundred generations by division, the animals began to decline, pathological changes appeared, the cilia were absent and the nuclei disintegrated. When this degeneration, which Maupas calls senile degeneration, had reached its maximum, nutrition became impossible and death followed. When he, however, allowed the mingling of a number from different parentage, conjugation took place, *i. e.*, two individuals united to form one new one, and this restored their full vigor, while conjugation of individuals from the same stock did not produce the same result. Decline, therefore, can only be repaired by conjugation of individuals from different parentage. Weismann, however, asserts likewise that conjugation is a necessary condition of the animal's life, just as fertilization is a necessary condition for the survival of an ovum, and if conjugation is denied, the death in consequence

is accidental and not natural; further, that the fact that conjugation is necessary does not imply that protoplasm is not potentially immortal. However, conjugation has not been shown to occur in many protozoa, and the only conclusion at present justifiable, is that protozoa, not too highly differentiated, living in natural conditions where conjugation is possible, have a freedom from natural death.

Accepting this general conclusion, we pass on to ask the question: How, then, did the death of the higher and multicellular organisms arise, and what does it involve?

There is now no longer any doubt that the metazoa, or multicellular animals, have at some time in the remote past been evolved from such potentially immortal protozoa. The tendency to form colonies and to live together in social communities is strongly inherent in the lowest forms of life; to this is evidently due the rise of the multicellular body which is essentially a complex colony of cells, in which there is more or less division of labor, and consequently a restriction of functions. A colony of choanoflagellata sinks by virtue of the law of gravity to the bottom of the sea, the lowest cells gradually lose all their functions but one, viz., that of resisting great pressure, thus becoming in the course of time, merely a mechanical support of the colony; the flagellata, constituting the periphery, perform the function of defense and of acquiring nutriment, the central individuals gradually retain but one function, namely, that of digesting the food furnished them by the outer members of the cormus. Such polymorphic conditions actually exist among the lowest metazoan beings. Like Maupas's isolated family of infusorians, the cells of the body do not conjugate with one another, and in spite of their continued division, life eventually ceases. Death, then, is the price paid for the body, the penalty which its attainment and possession sooner or later incur. A little further reflection, however, will show that in the majority of cases the organism does not wholly die. In some of the cells a concentration of function seems to have been retained, they escape the fate of the

body as reproductive elements, in reality, as protozoa once more. Certain of the lower forms, such as volvox, suggest this manner of evolution of the metazoa from the protozoa. Volvox is a hollow sphere of cells, which is provided with a couple of long flagella, by means of which the colony swims. Some of these cells pass to the centre of the sphere, and then undergo certain changes in form, becoming, in reality, the reproductive cells of the colony. When they are ripe the colony withers up and dies. Thus we find in volvox the first approach to a differentiation into Weissmann's germ and somatic cells. The same is true of all metazoa; they start their individual lives from an ovum, which is a single cell, comparable to a protozoan. After fertilization this cell or ovum undergoes the process of segmentation, *i. e.*, it divides into a multiple of two cells, giving rise to a very large number which differentiate in order to form tissues and organs of the embryo, the germ cells being finally deposited as it were in the generative glands of the animal, while the somatic cells form all other organs. During early youth the germ cells remain dormant; when, however, adult life is reached they develop, and under proper conditions, such as fertilization, etc., each one is capable of producing a new organism with germ-cells and body, while the body itself grows old and dies. In other words, what is new in the multicellular organism, namely, the "body," does indeed die, but the reproductive elements, which correspond to the protozoa, live on. "The body or soma," Weissmann says, "thus appears to a certain extent as a subsidiary appendage of the true bearers of the life—the reproductive cells." Ray Lankester sums up the whole process, when he expresses it thus: "Among the multicellular animals, certain cells are separated from the rest of the constituent units of the body as egg-cells and sperm-cells; these conjugate and continue to live, whilst the remaining cells, the mere carriers, as it were, of the immortal reproductive cells, die and disintegrate. The bodies of the higher animals which die may, from this point of view, be regarded as something temporary and non-essential, destined merely to carry for a time, to nurse and to nourish the more

important and deathless fission-products of the multicellular egg." Geddes beautifully remarks, "The bodies are but the torches which burn out, while the living flame has passed throughout the organic series unextinguished. The bodies are the leaves which fall in dying from the continuously growing branch. Thus, although death take inexorable grasp of the individual, the continuance of the life is still in a deep sense unaffected; the reproductive elements have already claimed their protozoan immortality—are already recreating a new body; so in the simplest physical as in the highest psychic life, we may say that love is stronger than death." Death, then, is something secondary; an adaptation acquired through natural selection during the evolution of the metazoa from the protozoa. In summing up the whole matter under consideration, I would say that two facts are established, viz.: on the one hand, the exemption from physical death of those protozoa which undergo conjugation; and, on the other hand, the beginning of death through the process of reproduction, the very blossoming of life in reproduction fated with the prophecy of death. Hence, it is but logical to throw the whole burden of the discussion upon the inquiry into the rise and significance of sexuality in its relation to death.

Already among the Protozoa we observe that conjugation preferably takes place between two individuals of different size, the one being comparatively large and in a state of rest, the other smaller and more active. The common Infusorian *Vorticella*, which is found in every water throughout this mundane sphere, reproduces itself by fission; one of the two new individuals swims freely about in the water for a time, and finally unites with a larger individual of different parentage, which is generally fastened by means of a stalk to some organic surface. A still more differentiated state of being is represented by the very interesting groups of certain flagellate Protozoan colonies, *e. g.*, *Eudorina*, *Pandorina* and *Volvox*, the last named being sometimes classified among the Metazoa. Here an alternation of generation occurs which is the first prophecy, as we might

say, of Metazoan life. A *Pandorina* may incompletely divide itself into a number of individuals which together form a colony, each member of the colony again dividing into a number of individuals of like size, every one of which becomes a free swimming *Pandorina*, which propagates itself by first uniting with another individual of different parentage entering upon a state of rest preparatory to the cycle of fission. In *Endorina* and *Volvox* the same process is observed, with this difference, however, that here, for the first time, a division into colonies of individuals of different size and habit arises, namely, into macrospores or large resting Protozoa and into microspores or small active Protozoa; the former are frequently called ovoid gametæ, the latter spermoid gametæ. Besides in *Volvox* a division of labor occurs, inasmuch as only certain individuals are reproductive, others seemingly carrying on the function of nutrition for the whole colony. Here death occurs for the first time in the animal world, namely, the death of the purely nutritive individuals. He who wants to see may learn his first lesson as to the significance of death and immortality in the physical sense; immortality in these lowest forms seems to be bound up with altruism, conjugation meaning no more nor less than mutual attraction or love; love as the guarantee of life in the very lowest organisms proves the tendency of organic evolution. It is from this point of view alone that we can explain the necessity of sexual differentiation. Sexuality has been the means through which morphological complexes or organisms of all sorts, animal and vegetable, have been built up. For mere purposes of reproduction sexuality was certainly not necessary. It becomes more specialized with the progress of structural complication of organisms; but external influences may lead to the suppression of fully developed sexuality. It has been proved, over and over again, that if a species is artificially cared for, *i. e.*, cultivated, as in the case of plants, it may be indefinitely reproduced by means other than those of sexuality. I need only cite the Banana, which has been asexually propagated by cuttings for centuries. The signifi-

cant and persistent vigor, through twenty centuries, of *Draecena* or Dragon's-blood tree is also of interest in this connection, and would show that plant life as such is potentially immortal under any condition, whether propagated by conjugation or not. The persistent growth of the asexual generations of tree ferns in the present age, and of the gigantic *Lepidodendrons* and *Equisetums* of the carboniferous period, shows that conditions of life have much to do in maintaining the vigor of such asexual generations. Neither has it been proved that death ever occurred in the generations of the yeast plant and of the Bacteria on account of the absence of the process of conjugation. Nay, both conjugation and sexuality as functions seem to demonstrate the chief property of life, namely, infinite variation and complexity, reflecting the eternal attributes and purposes of its divine Author. Passing then from the unconditionally physically immortal in the vegetable kingdom, to the conditionally immortal in the protozoan animal sphere, and thence to the universal occurrence of death in the metazoan world, I would maintain that while reproduction is fraught with death to the corporeal, the increasing complexity of its apparatus expressed in the rise and relation of the sexes is not in the least necessitated by reproduction as such. The divine immanence of life is the everlasting force pressing for reproduction, and the eternal love of the Father of all creation finds its expression in a multiplicity of means and methods, to be sacrificed on the altar of life, for the very purpose of developing the spirit of self-surrender. Therefore animals do not reproduce because they have to die, but they die because they have to reproduce, or, as Goette has it: "It is not death that makes reproduction necessary, but reproduction has death as its inevitable consequence." Illustrations of this are numerous in the vegetable as well as in the animal world. The mature female forms of the orthonectids, the very lowest of the metazoan animals, produce numerous germ cells and terminate their individual lives by bursting. The germs are liberated; the mother animal has been sacrificed in reproduc-

tion. In some species of the polygordius worm the mature females break up and die in liberating their ova, while the young of certain threadworms live at the expense of the mother, until she is reduced to a mere husk. Kræpelin reports that the ciliated embryo of certain fresh-water Polyzoa leaves the maternal body-cavity through a prolapsus uteri of the sacrificed mother. It is a matter of common knowledge how many insects die a few hours after the production of ova. The exhaustion is fatal for both male and female; as a matter of fact the former are more liable to exhaustion than the latter. Geddes reports that the males of some spiders normally die after fertilizing the female, a fact perhaps helping to throw light upon the sacrifice of others to their mates. The close association of love and death in the common mayflies is another familiar phenomenon. Within a few hours we witness the emergence into winged liberty, the love dance and the process of fertilization, the deposition of eggs and the death of both parents. In higher animals reproductive sacrifice may be less often fatal, yet how often is death, even in human life, the direct nemesis of love!

The gradual evolution of sexuality and its perfection seems to go hand in hand with the psychic development of the individual. From a sexual fragmentation and consequent multiplication, the advance to larger and smaller, or female and male elements was a gradual one, with or without hermaphroditism. Then came hermaphroditism with large female and small male germs, then maleness and femaleness, as characterizing distinct individuals of the same species. Finally, protective processes were developed, accompanied by ovulation, followed by parental care, such as incubation, nidification, gestation and at last, in the highest forms, lactation was developed. *Pari passu* with this development we find a corresponding increase in the relation of the two elements. In the lowest forms when two exhausted cells flow together physical attraction is pre-eminent, it is simply a "satisfaction of protoplasmic hunger;" later on the union becomes physiological, the spermatozoa are attracted

by certain acids which the ova excrete; gradually, however, the sexes associate in pairs, first noticed among insects. Some psychic sexual attraction leads to the association of two individuals for a certain length of time, bringing about a co-operation in their work, *e. g.*, male and female of a certain lamellicorn beetle inhabit the same cavity, and the virtuous matron is said greatly to resent the intrusion of another male. In other cases sexes are attracted through the power of sound, from the shrill chirping of grasshoppers to the touching song of the nightingale, likewise the complex play of colors in the garments of birds, the exhibition of strength and courage of male mammals in battle excite the inclination of the female. Not only is there often partnership, co-operation, and evident affection beyond the limits of the breeding periods among birds and mammals, but there are abundant illustrations of a high standard of morality, of all the familiar sexual crimes of mankind and of every shade of flirtation, courtship, jealousy and the like. (Compare Büchner's "*Liebe und Liebesleben in der Thierwelt.*") Mantegazza, in his work on "*The Physiology of Love,*" claims that love is the universal dynamic, that the whole nature is one hymn of love. This often-repeated utterance seems to have more than poetic significance, although in actual life such love is rarely found in pure form. Yet do not the most splendid achievements in human history, as well as the resplendent beauty of animated nature, bear a significant relation to the passion of love?

All this would indicate that the potentially immortal germ cells have a much profounder significance than is generally granted them. Being in reality the ancestors or authors of the somatic cells or "body," they seem to control the highest interests of physical existence, they are, to say the least, in close contact with our psychic life, and their continuance furnishes an analogy to the manner in which, after the dissolution of human corporeity, the soul may reconstruct "somatic cells" adapted to its new environment.

But to return to Weismann's views: If death is not some-

thing which is inherent in living matter, but which is acquired, how is it that the length of life differs so widely in different species? Weissmann answers that the age which an animal may attain has been determined by natural selection, and also that the power of reproduction and length of life are correlated, as shown in the following examples from Gardiner: Birds generally live to a very great age. A partridge lives from twenty to twenty-five years. A pair of eider ducks were observed nesting in the same place for twenty years, and it is believed that these birds often reach the age of a hundred. Birds of prey become much older, for they outlive more than one generation of men. A white-headed vulture was kept in a zoological garden in Germany for one hundred and eighteen years, and many examples of eagles and falcons reaching an age of over a hundred years have been recorded. Humboldt mentions a parrot from the Orinoco, of which the Indians told that none could understand it, for it spoke the language of an extinct race.

Now let us compare the length of life and reproductive powers of the partridge and an eagle and find the reason why one should live longer than the other. The partridge lives a little more than twenty years, and each year lays about twenty eggs. Hence a pair of partridges may produce about four hundred eggs in their life-time. This is at the rate of two thousand in a hundred years. Yet since the number of partridges in the forest does not increase, three hundred and ninety-eight of these eggs or young must be destroyed in twenty years while but two survive to take the place of their parents. The eggs and young are destroyed by beasts and birds of prey. If these enemies increased very much the partridge would become extinct unless it laid more eggs. It would appear, then, that the partridge lays just eggs enough to ensure the continuance of its race, and this being accomplished death removes it.

The eagle, on the other hand, is one of the most powerful birds, and builds its nest on such inaccessible cliffs that eggs and young are comparatively safe from marauding animals. Many, however, are destroyed by late frosts and snows. The

duration of the life of an eagle is about sixty years, of which ten years belong to immaturity, so that fifty years remain for reproduction. If the eagle lays but two eggs a year a pair of eagles would produce one hundred during their life-time. In a hundred years two hundred eggs against the partridge's two thousand; therefore the partridge produces ten times as many young as the eagle, and we do not go wrong in saying that the partridge has ten times as many enemies as the eagle. If the life of either were shortened the race would die out, unless the power of reproduction were increased or the struggle for existence became less severe.

The elephant may live for a hundred or perhaps a hundred and fifty years, and reaches maturity when about thirty. A pair produce but a single calf about every ten years, hence during their life-time a pair of elephants contribute but ten or a dozen young to the race. Among the lower animals reproduction is frequent and enormous on account of the great multitude of enemies which constantly destroy the offspring.

Man hardly offers definite scientific data to present accurate calculations as to the causes of the length of his age. One thing we are sure of, and that is the fact that thousands hasten to an early grave on account of a wanton premature destruction of their germ cells. If nowhere else, here surely a striking proof is offered for the arguments presented on the origin of death.

VII.

DR. TITZEL ON DEATH AND THE RESURRECTION.

BY CALVIN S. GERHARD, D.D.

IN the October number of this REVIEW there appeared from the pen of one of the editors, the Rev. Dr. John M. Titzel, a lengthy notice of my book, "Death and the Resurrection." His article is in some respects a peculiar one. Differing entirely from the position taken by the REVIEW in its book notices in the July number, he writes not as an editor, but as an individual contributor, and thus himself personally assumes all responsibility for the views which he sets forth. His one and only aim seems to be to completely demolish the little volume which he attacks. Like a schoolmaster who reviews his pupil's essay, he begins with the grammar and the rhetoric, and actually finds several imperfect sentences. He deserves great credit for his persistent efforts in this direction. So keen is his scent and so difficult his undertaking that even the following innocent-looking clauses fall under the ban of his condemnation: "These great truths, under the influence of which, some to a greater degree than others, the sacred writers lived and wrote," and, "the antidote at once, both for atheism and materialism, as well as for agnosticism and pantheism."

That all may see by way of contrast how faultlessly Dr. Titzel's sentences are constructed, I now call attention to the following specimens: "that the views of these theologians logically imply the same as his own, by maintaining that transformation and death are essentially the same," p. 518; "that a body . . . should be, in a few hours, so developed as to enable its possessor the full enjoyment of conscious existence," p. 518; "The fact that the resurrection is always referred to as something future is opposed to such view. To say that it is thus spoken

of because only at the last day it will be fully consummated, is virtually to charge the sacred writers with using words without any proper discrimination as to their meaning. Furthermore, the manner in which the intermediate state is spoken of in Scripture cannot be reconciled with it," p. 514. A question in grammar: What is the antecedent of the pronoun "it" with which the last sentence closes?

In the next place my critic accuses me of looseness of reasoning and unguardedness of expression because I say on page 21 that God has so constituted man that the proper interpretation of the phenomena of nature must always be learned, not from the book of revelation, but from the book of nature. "Now we admit," he continues, "that God has not seen proper to reveal to men what they can learn without revelation; but we do not admit that there is any proof, or any reason to believe that man is so constituted that God could not make such revelation if He saw proper so to do, and we believe that the sacred writers have in many cases more correctly interpreted the phenomena of nature through inspiration of the Holy Ghost than any scientists have done by deductions from their experiments." Here there is close reasoning and guardedness of expression! It proceeds as follows: God has not seen proper to reveal to men what they can learn without revelation and yet (in many cases) He has done so!! What God *could* do I do not profess to know or to say, but surely all must admit that He has so constituted man that empirical knowledge is acquired from nature through the activity of the natural understanding, while spiritual things are spiritually discerned.

Again, I am criticised for saying that Christ put Himself *en rapport* with His age and people, and that He stood within the bosom of the theological thinking of His age. "If this is so," my censor exclaims, "how came the people to revile Him and to condemn and crucify Him?" Let me ask another question. Why are the clearest exponents of the best and the most profound thought of every age similarly dealt with? Why were the Reformers persecuted? Why was Socrates condemned to drink

the fatal hemlock? Was he not the product of that which was deepest and truest in Greek life? Was it not his environment as much as his genius that made him what he was? And so, was not Jesus Christ the offspring of David, the Lion of the tribe of Judah and the outgrowth of Israel? Surely He did not stand within the bosom of Greek, or Roman, or Mediæval, or modern thought, but within the bosom of the thinking of His own age and people, at the same time that through His unique personality He had a more profound insight into the truth than any one else. As He had two natures, the one human and the other divine, so also He stood in a double environment. As the Word made flesh, He, of course, transcended all ages and all peoples for He was not only the Son of man, but also the Son of God, and thus one with the Father.

"Man cannot by searching find out God, or the relation which He sustains to the universe. Natural laws and phenomena reveal Him not." "Creation and providence reveal His presence in upholding the world and in constantly unfolding His thoughts by evolving higher forms of existence and of life through the operation of natural laws which are the continuous expression of His will." These two statements, it is claimed, directly contradict each other. Although torn out of their connection, I ask the candid reader whether they really contradict one another even when used as my critic employs them. What does the first statement mean but this? Without revelation man cannot know God. Naturalists, like Darwin and Huxley, do not find Him by studying natural laws and phenomena. And what does the second mean except this? The believer sees God in His works. Creation and providence reveal His presence to faith; to those who believe that He is, and to them only. The expression cannot possibly mean anything else, since it is only believers that accept the doctrine of creation and providence.

But my critic's wisdom in regard to my inconsistencies reaches its climax when he tells us that in the following sentences there is a reference to burial and the body when the

word sheol is used: "If mischief befall him in the way in which ye go, then shall ye bring down my gray hairs with sorrow to sheol," and, "Let not his hoar head go down to sheol in peace." This is quibbling of the worst sort, since to every unprejudiced mind it is evident that Jacob's language clearly means simply this: If you allow harm to come to Benjamin you shall bring me down to death. No one can deny that the expression is figurative, and that the figure stands, not for the patriarch's body, but for his person. His concern was not for his hair, but for himself. He felt that if mischief befell Benjamin he would die of grief—in sorrow he would go down to sheol, the place of departed spirits, into which his earthly body could not enter.

In regard to the views set forth in my book it is claimed, in the first place, that the Scripture passages which I quote in reference to man's natural mortality "give no real support whatever to the doctrine under consideration." The first of these is Gen 3: 19, and the second 1 Cor. 15: 47-50. Of these quotations Meyer, in his commentry on 1 Corinthians *in loco* says: "Since the body of Adam is thus characterized as a psychical (animal) body, as verse 45, and animal organism involves mortality (verse 44), it is clear that Paul treats of Adam *not as created exempt from death*, in strict accordance with Gen. 2: 7 and 3: 19. Nor does this militate against his teaching that death came into the world through sin, Rom. 5: 12. For had our first parents not sinned they would have remained in Paradise, and would, by the use of the *Tree of Life*, which God had not forbidden them (Gen. 2: 16, 17), *have become immortal* (Gen. 3: 22). But they were driven out of Paradise ere yet they had tasted of this tree (Gen. 3: 22), and so, according to the record in Genesis also, "Death came into the world by sin."

This is precisely what I say on page 12, viz.: "According to the account in Genesis, man was created mortal, but was capable of attaining unto immortality. To have partaken of the tree of life would have caused him to live forever. By eating of the forbidden fruit he lost the privilege of eating of the tree

of life—that is, sin interrupted his communion with God and prevented him from appropriating the divine life, which is the only life that abides forever. In the day that he ate of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil he died—*forfeited his communion with God*. But as his act of disobedience did not destroy his natural life, so neither would obedience and righteousness have removed the necessity of physical dissolution.” “All mankind (page 56) are familiar with physical death, not as it would have occurred in the absence of sin, but as it takes place with sin in the world as a tremendous power of evil and destruction. ‘No doubt,’ says Alexander McClaren, ‘*cessation of physical life is necessarily involved in the fact of possessing it*, but the complex whole, made up of pains and terrors, which we know by the name of Death, is the result of sin.’ All this is in full accord with St. Paul’s emphatic unequivocal declaration: “Flesh and blood *cannot* inherit the kingdom of God” (1 Cor. 15: 47). Flesh and blood—that is, the present organism of the body, calculated for the wants of the animal soul, must pass away. This organism is mortal and always has been.

In a review of my book in the New York *Independent* of October 8d, 1895, Dr. Thomas G. Apple says: “The sting of death is sin; but the question remains whether what is essential in physical death, viz., the separation of the life principle from the material body, or the matter which enters into the body, would not have taken place even if man had not sinned. This contention, which science seems to require, the author maintains, *and without any necessary conflict with revelation . . .* Even those who maintain that physical death was caused by sin allow that some change would have been necessary, some translation from the natural into the spiritual order; but this is only substituting another word for death while it does not remove the contradiction between the original design of the Creator, as it appears in the light of science, and the current teaching of theology.”

A great deal more could easily be said and quoted in defense of my position on the point before us, but I will content myself with one additional remark. My critic makes merry over the

fact that I say: "The worm must pass away—must die—in order that the butterfly may be formed and live." "Every one," he exclaims, "acquainted with natural history, knows that the butterfly is only a fully developed and transformed caterpillar. The worm does not die that the butterfly may be formed and live. On the contrary, if the worm be injured so that it dies and its dissolution takes place, there will be no butterfly. By such reasoning as we have in the passage just given, anything may be proved, as all distinctions are ignored in thus using words and confounding their meaning." In making use of this extravagant language Dr. Titzel seems to forget entirely that One greater than either of us said: "Verily, verily, I say unto you, except a grain of wheat fall into the earth and *die*, it abideth by itself alone; but if it *die*, it beareth much fruit" (John 12: 24). St. Paul also said: "Thou foolish one, that which thou thyself sowest is not quickened, except it *die*" (1 Cor. 15: 36). It is from these Masters that I have taken lessons. The same analogy which they use in reference to a seed I employ in reference to a caterpillar. The seed dies in precisely the same sense when it grows into a stalk as the caterpillar does when it passes into a butterfly. "If the" seed "be injured so that it dies and its dissolution takes place, there will be no" stalk. See pages 53 and 139 for a fuller exposition of the analogy of the seed as used by our Lord and by St. Paul.

"We believe," says my reviewer, "that death separates soul and body; that after the separation, the soul continues its conscious existence in a state of happiness as regards the righteous, and of misery as regards the unrighteous, and that at the resurrection, which will take place when Christ comes again, soul and body will be reunited and completely perfected." Of this view of the resurrection it has been well said: Men still assert in words a literal resurrection of the body, but none of us believe it. Our hymns, our prayers, our epitaphs, and too often our sermons, imply that the dust of our bodies shall be reanimated in some far-off future and joined to the soul. At the same time we know that science declares it to be impossible;

our reason revolts from it; it is sustained by no analogy; it is an outworn and nearly discarded opinion. Teach a thinking man chemistry and he must be skeptical in regard to such a view; mathematics even is against it. It is an unhappy thing when one revelation of God is set in apparent opposition to another. When such is the case, the higher revelation commonly yields before the lower one; we side with the lower because it is nearer. The wiser way is to harmonize them; for God cannot be inconsistent with Himself.

Dr. Titzel's defence of this worn-out theory breaks down at every point. First, he claims that "the resurrection (p. 514) is always referred to as something future." But when Martha said of her brother Lazarus, "I know that he shall rise again in the resurrection at the last day," Jesus plainly showed by His answer that the primary truth to be believed, in reference to the resurrection, was, that in Him it was a present reality. So, also, in His reply to the Sadducees, He emphasized the same fact when He said, "*That the dead are raised even Moses showed. . . . for all live unto God.*" St. Paul also said: "We know that if our earthly house of this tabernacle be dissolved we *have* a building of God, a house not made with hands, eternal, in the heavens."

The word resurrection, like the word death, is not always used in the same sense in the Scriptures. To St. Paul it evidently meant three things: first, it signified spiritual quickening, life-union with Jesus Christ on earth (Col. 3: 1; Rom. 6: 5; Eph. 2: 6); secondly, it meant to depart and be with Christ, because to die was not to be unclothed, but to be clothed upon, with our house from heaven (2 Cor. 5: 2); thirdly, to be glorified through the final manifestation of Jesus Christ in His second advent was the completion of the resurrection, because it involved emergence from the state of the dead into perfected spiritual and corporeal life.

My critic claims that because the departed are referred to as having fallen asleep through death, and as being awakened through the resurrection, my view cannot be reconciled with

the manner in which the intermediate state is spoken of in Scripture. But since he admits that "the soul continues its conscious existence" after natural decease has taken place, what he says of sleep is just as applicable to his view as to mine. Jesus and His Apostles, by their use of the word sleep, teach us that death is not what it seems to be—that it is not extinction, but that although the eyes are closed and the heart has stopped beating, life still exists, though we may not know how, or where, and that it is going forward, in all its grand and beautiful functions, and shall in the end be completely manifested in the marvelous awakening of the last day.

What else the Sadducees might have believed if they had admitted that the soul exists consciously after death I cannot tell, although I do know that the Greeks believed in the immortality of the soul, but denied the resurrection. What "the Sadducees would undoubtedly have believed," is not the point, but, what does the Saviour's reply to their question teach us? "The central idea of Christ's answer," says Theodore T. Munger, "is, that because the patriarchs are alive, they have been raised up. Their resurrection is the pivot upon which their present life turns. If Christ's words do not mean this, we must despair of language as a vehicle of thought."

"As for the claim (page 515) that in man body and spirit (mind, he means) are so related that they cannot be separated without wholly destroying conscious existence, there is really no conclusive evidence that such is the case. It is merely an assumption." In the Schaff-Herzog Encyclopædia of Religious Knowledge, Vol. II., p. 1066, Ulrici, translated by Newman Smyth, says: "We must admit absolutely, in view of scientific facts, that a continuous existence of self-consciousness without a bodily organism cannot be considered. Natural science is therefore right when it steadfastly denies immortality as an isolated continuance of the soul separated from all embodiment." There is no conflict whatever between this direct and positive statement and my critic's quotation from *The Destiny of Man*. What Mr. Fiske says, plainly refers to the natural body, and as such all

who think as I do are in full agreement with him. Therefore Dr. Titzel's quotation is not applicable. The question is not whether the soul can have conscious existence without the animal organism in which it lives in this world. All Christian scientists admit that it can. But what science and revelation both teach is that when physical dissolution takes place, in order that there may be active, conscious life, the soul must at once have some kind of embodiment. When the earthly house is dissolved there immediately succeeds to the natural body "a building of God, a house not made with hands, eternal, in the heavens."

From what has now been said it is evident that none of the Scripture passages quoted in reference to the point under consideration have any bearing on the subject. When, for example, Jesus said: "Father, into Thy hands I commend My Spirit," He did not think of mind apart from corporeity, but of whatever survived after physical dissolution had taken place. Query: Cannot the dead, though living in spiritual bodies, be spoken of as "spirits" with as much propriety as men in this life can be referred to as "souls," as for instance when it is said in Acts 2: 41, "And there were added unto them in that day about 3,000 souls?" In passing let me call the reader's special attention to my critic's exegesis of Gen. 2: 7 and Matt. 10: 28.

In returning and aiming at what appears to be his favorite target he tells us that when a caterpillar is changed into a butterfly, "such change takes place only when it has reached a certain state of development, and that if wheat be harvested when very immature, the grains will shrivel, and, if sown, will produce nothing." The absurdity here propounded by pressing the analogy employed by Jesus and by St. Paul beyond all possible bounds is so glaring that it is its own best refutation. What human death is at one period of life it unquestionably is at every other period. It is the same whether the subject of it be a day or a hundred years old.

But the miracle of raising Lazarus, it is assumed, will certainly settle the question at issue between us. My reviewer has a theory according to which it can be "easily and rationally

explained." "Jesus, by divine power, brought soul and body together again, and then Lazarus came forth from his grave." All very easy and rational! No trouble about getting the soul back into a body that was undergoing corruption. But if the soul of the poor man did not remain entirely naked during the four days that he was dead, the spiritual body which kept him in conscious existence had to be forced back again into mere potentiality! Is this last the only thing that involves an absurdity in what my critic has to say of this miracle? Is not rather his entire treatment of the subject supremely absurd?

"Again it is claimed that if consciousness immediately follows death and the actual development of the spiritual body nevertheless begins only at death, it is at variance with our scientific knowledge that a body which shall reach its complete development only in the course of thousands of years, nevertheless should be in a few hours so developed as to enable its possessor to have full enjoyment of conscious existence." This we fail to see, because the spiritual body may unfold almost instantaneously at death, like a blossom, and thus form the necessary medium of expression for the soul which has been growing during its earthly sojourn period, and which, therefore, at once needs not only the nucleus of a body, but a body in some sense adequate to its maturing wants, and yet that body, like fruit contained in undeveloped form in the blossom, may not reach maturity before Christ shall come and through the final revelation and transformation of the second advent furnish the inward power as well as the external environment for the full completion of human life in the kingdom of glory, when all men shall be suddenly brought through a final crisis into their ultimate form of existence.

In regard to the resurrection of Christ my critic tells us that "unquestionably the evangelists were all of the opinion that the body of Jesus which was laid in the grave was that which arose, and which the disciples saw, and that the importance which they attach to the empty tomb proves that such was the case." Two things they certainly knew: the tomb

was empty, and Jesus was alive. But we have no evidence whatever that they asked themselves how His risen body was related to His remains. That particular inquiry did not confront the disciples, and therefore they do not express an opinion, or furnish testimony in regard to it. In the development of Christian doctrine the question has, however, been frequently raised and the subject will no doubt continue to engage the attention of thoughtful minds.

Let us assume then that there was a physical restoration. But Jesus, on the very same day that He rose, appeared in the room where the disciples were assembled for fear of the Jews, the doors being shut, and said: "Peace be unto you." How could He do this? All will admit that it was physically impossible for such a body as He possessed before He died to pass through closed doors. But this much being granted, the theory that there was a physical restoration cannot be maintained. Jesus could enter the room as He did only because His body was no longer composed of "earthly" matter, but of some "material" which can penetrate solids. But does not the assumption that there is such a substance involve a contradiction? No, science has taught us that there is a great ocean of physical being called ether, which fills all space, penetrates all matter and serves as the medium for the transmission and propagation of light, heat, electricity and gravity, and that matter itself is but knots, aggregations, temporary arrangements of this universal ether. When light passes through a window pane the particles of which the glass is composed remain unmoved, but the light is carried by the ether which moves in waves among the vitreous molecules. We can account satisfactorily for the peculiar characteristics of our Saviour's resurrection body only by assuming that it was constituted of some substance having properties similar to those of ether, and yet more real than the gross forms of matter of which our natural bodies are composed and, therefore, a better medium for the expression of human life in a higher stage of existence. It was no longer a natural body, manifesting the life of "the living (animal)

soul," but having become the organ of "the life-giving spirit," it was a spiritual body. But the natural being embraced in and being under the power of the spiritual, Jesus could still manifest Himself within the sphere of nature, and accordingly could make Himself visible to the eyes of His disciples, could show the print of the nails, and could eat before them.

"That He ate," says Augustine, "was the fruit of His power, not of His necessity." The difficulty of accounting for the fact is similar to that which confronts us in the case of the angels who appeared to Abraham and Lot and partook of food (Gen. 18: 8 and 19: 3). The cases are not parallel, but have much in common. In reference to the angels Delitzsch says: "The human form, in which they appeared, was a representation of their invisible nature, and thus they ate, according to Justin Martyr, as we say of the fire, it consumes (or eats) all." "There may be here," says Dr. J. P. Lange, "an intimation of the mysterious fact that the spiritual world is mighty in its manifestations, and overcomes the material, according to the figurative expression of Augustine: 'The thirsting earth absorbs the water in one way, the burning rays of the sun in another; that from want, this by power.'" Baumgarten also says: "That the angels could eat, lies in their pneumatic nature, for the spirit has power over matter." How much less then could nature offer barriers to our Blessed Lord who had been raised into fullness of spiritual life on the third day?

Whatever was essential to His perfected personality in spirit, soul and body, Jesus Christ possessed as risen. He died and at the same time surmounted death, physical dissolution being the necessary condition of transition to a higher form of life. According to the best commentators 1 Peter 3: 18, "Being put to death in the flesh, but quickened in the Spirit," teaches that at the very moment when Jesus died He was also made alive. This great truth is illustrated by the analogy of the seed which when cast into the ground dies and yet lives—ceases to exist as a seed and survives as a stalk. In a profound sense it dies—gives up its specific form of existence through the entrance

of its life principle into another form. The germ is not separated from the body of the seed and then at some future time brought back to it again, but the stalk is raised up out of the seed through the living process of germination and growth. The law of succession does not consist in the one bodily form entering into another, but rather in the new getting rid of the old. The seed as such does not pass over into the stalk. In germination the albumen is absorbed, but the wrappings, which enclosed it and the life-germ, decay and become to the new plant no more than other matter. Therefore, if Jesus Christ died, in order that through death He might enter into a higher form of life, then His remains were not essential to the existence of His spiritual body, for at the very same time that these were laid aside in death He was made alive in the Spirit, and thus began to live in His spiritual body.

Whatever in His previous form of life could be made to minister to His advanced stage of existence was no doubt assimilated. This assimilation may have been, however, fully accomplished while He was dying, so that if His remains should have been stolen from the tomb and cremated that would not have changed the character of His resurrection, or the nature of His resurrection body. No one certainly would have the temerity to maintain that the preservation of His remains was essential to His resurrection. What actually became of them is a speculative question which we may not be able to answer categorically. Neither is it necessary that we should, provided we hold fast the great truth that on the third day He rose into full corporeal life.

When my critic proceeds to consider the resurrection under its positive aspects, he vainly struggles to remove the impediments which encumber his theory. He says: "But, perhaps, it will be asked, Does not the view that the crucified body of Jesus was raised up again, require us to hold that the bodies of all the dead will be similarly raised, and does not this involve insuperable difficulties? We think not." Here two questions are propounded, and the reader is left in doubt as to whether the negative

answer is intended to cover one or both. Then follows a quotation from Dr. James Strong, who tells us that the difficulties raised by supposing that the same matter may have entered into the composition of different bodies successively is imaginary, because God might easily prevent such a fortuity. But that sounds like a weak reply. Accordingly Dr. Strong adds: "In any case, the amount of such re-used matter would be too trifling to affect the question seriously." Feeling that he is only getting deeper into the difficulty he continues: "But this absolute sameness of the very atoms" (yet this is the precise point which he has raised) "is not necessary, for in this sense no individual body is the same at different periods, hardly, indeed, an hour together." Thus, while starting out to maintain that the atoms *are* the same, he concludes by proving that they are *not* the same, and holds that they only need to be *similar*, and to be animated by the same soul. This reasoning Dr. Titzel endorses and thereby surrenders his case, for such reasoning completely subverts his continual assumption, viz., that the resurrection consists in raising up what is buried.

The Scriptures teach the resurrection of the dead—emergence from death into full corporeal life. What all is involved in the transition, and how the glorious consummation is effected is a mystery, and therefore hard to conceive and not fully capable of explanation. But this we know, that as in Adam all die because of their organic relation to him, so also in virtue of their still deeper and more far-reaching relation to Jesus Christ all shall be made alive in Him, who, as the archetypal Man, the Second Adam, is the original root out of which the race has sprung, and through whom also it reaches its ultimate form of existence. He is the first and the last, the beginning and the end.

In the early Church there was a division of opinion in regard to the true nature of the resurrection. Greek thought, as represented by Clement of Alexandria, did not accept the opinion which was received in the West and maintained by Tertullian, that the identical flesh of the body which had been

laid in the grave would be reanimated. The resurrection was the standing up again of the dead in greater fulness of life, in spirit, soul and body. During the Middle Ages and the Reformation period, the study of eschatology did not receive much attention. Since then, and particularly during the latter part of the present century, a new interest has been awakened in the subject. The more it is considered and investigated, the larger is the number of those who have come to the conclusion that while the Bible emphasizes the resurrection of the dead, it does not teach the resuscitation of the physical remains. We believe in the resurrection of the dead, and therefore most heartily in the resurrection of the body, for man consists of body as well as of soul and spirit, but we do not believe in the resurrection of the corpse.

This is the view very generally entertained in the Reformed Church. In his *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, Vol. II., p. 849, Dr. E. V. Gerhart expresses himself as follows: "In the new life, the type and law of the resurrection body are potential forces, but the life is not its own pabulum. From itself exclusively it cannot evolve the glorified form of organization. For the pabulum of complete organization, the spiritual man, like the natural man, depends on a corresponding environment, an external homogeneous world. That necessary environment is the new cosmos, the final creation of the immanent Christ, which will reach its consummation at His second coming. Until then the righteous will not possess the mature glorified embodiment. Being neither in the natural body, nor clothed with the resurrection body, but living in a spiritual form supported by and corresponding to the environment of the intermediate realm, they will be corporeal in principle rather than actually. The law of their intermediate life of blessedness is somatic, but the operation of the law is in a relative sense suspended.

"In the final catastrophe, when at the second coming the new heaven and the new earth will supersede the existing cosmos and the blessedness of Paradise, the conditions and relations

of the righteous will be changed. In that final epoch of their history they will be released from incompleteness and from the suspense of the ultimate perfection. Spiritual life will unfold itself in a form fully answering to its own law in the bosom of the world to come. That world will supply the needful pabulum of the spiritual body. From the paradisaical realm the righteous will go forth in a new corporeal organism, the building of God, a house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens, a building which will be the structure of the form-producing type of Christ's life in His members, the necessary material being given by the new environment, the perfected condition of the cosmos."

Instruction like this, imparted during my seminary course, by the honored teacher who has grown old in the service of the Church, but is still young in spirit and in vigor of mind and body, first opened to me the line of thought which has issued in the publication of my book. On some minor points I no doubt differ with him, but on the general subject of the resurrection of the dead I believe that we are in substantial agreement.

That my views have been received with very general approval by leaders of thought in the Reformed and other Churches, is indicated by the following excerpts:

"I can heartily endorse your positions, although they are in advance of the current theology. . . . I am quite satisfied with the book. It places you in line with the advanced theological thinkers of the times." Dr. Thomas G. Apple, in a letter to the author, May 25, 1895.

"We have only to say that the theme, though old, is presented in a new and interesting light. Its treatment displays marked philosophic as well as literary skill. It is evident that the author has not only read extensively and with attentive consideration, but that he has also pondered long and profoundly on some of the most perplexing, yet, at the same time, fascinating problems that have ever engaged the human mind. We doubt not that, in general, his solutions are in harmony,

as well with the Bible, when rightly interpreted, as with the best results of modern thought. . . . The style is simple, yet elegant; vigorous, yet smooth. The language of the book is free from all technicalities, and can be understood by any intelligent reader as easily as by the professional theologian. The author knows what he wishes to say, and, for the most part, has no difficulty in making his meaning clear. Occasionally, indeed, we have met with an expression, or even a statement, liable to be misunderstood; but this is a rare occurrence. We take pleasure in commending to the public this fresh, interesting and thoughtful book." Dr. F. A. Gast, in *The New Era*, Lancaster, Pa., June 22, 1895.

"The book shows wide reading on the part of its author. It has not been a hasty production. The author has gone generally through the literature of his subject, and has written thoughtfully, cautiously, and with a masterly grasp of his material. The style is plain, direct, and forcible. . . . That all readers will agree with the positions taken by the author is not to be expected. Some will doubtless dissent from the conclusions which have been reached by the learned author, but we predict that a far larger number, after a careful perusal of his pages, will be in substantial agreement with him." Dr. William Rupp, in *The Reformed Church Messenger*, March 28, 1895.

"This is a notable book and one that deserves, as we are sure it will receive, serious attention from the theological world as well as from the Christian public in general. Thoughtful, earnest, suggestive and devout, it furnishes food for thought, emphasizes the precious truth of the gospel, and strengthens faith in the supernatural realities of divine revelation. At the same time it makes earnest with the facts established by natural science, and treats its difficult theme with commendable candor and remarkable ability. Every page of the book gives evidence of wide reading, careful study and vigor of thought, while the style in which it is written is forcible, clear and sparkling. . . . The author's treatment of his theme must challenge

serious thought. He throws new light on difficult questions; he is abreast with the science of the day; he is devoutly reverent in his treatment of the Scriptures; and he preserves intact every essential article of the Christian faith." Dr. John S. Stahr, in *The Reformed Quarterly Review*, July, 1895.

"The aim of this book is to strengthen our faith and fortify it against the possible assaults of its enemies. The work is an earnest and creditable contribution to the solution of great questions. With the most of its positions I heartily agree, and feel grateful to the author for the benefits of its perusal. He sheds new light on certain dark passages by holding the torch of science over them. Thus he makes science a handmaid instead of a hindrance to religion." Dr. B. Bausman, in *The Reformed Church Record*, May 9, 1895.

"We readily accept the views of the writer concerning creation, the nature of man, the original and natural mortality of the human body, and sin as not having caused, but only modified, this mortality; but it does not seem to us that his peculiar view of the resurrection of Christ follows from these as an absolutely necessary consequence. . . . While we cannot, for the present at least, accept Dr. Gerhard's view of the resurrection of Christ (though accepting many of the after-views contained in the volume), we wish to say that his book is one which we gladly and heartily welcome. . . . The temper and spirit of this book are worthy of much praise. The volume has the charm of a very lucid style and the strength of very able argument. It is a book of investigation; it is, as its title imports, an earnest inquiry into the true nature of death and the resurrection; and, as such, deserves to be widely read and carefully considered." Dr. J. Spangler Kieffer, in *The Reformed Church Messenger*, May 30, 1895.

"The book is strongly written. The author's discussion of his subject is full and clear; his meaning is never left to conjecture; he states his propositions squarely and broadly. . . . The views of the author, though decided and expressed so as to leave no doubt as to his meaning, are yet temperately and

reverently stated. The book breathes throughout the spirit of Christian enthusiasm and the strong faith of the true believer. You can feel as you read that the Christianity of the author seems to feed and grow strong upon the great thoughts which he expresses. It is not skepticism; it is an honest search for the truth by one who accepts, without doubt, the religion of Jesus Christ. We commend the book to all honest searchers after truth." The Hon. George F. Baer, in *The Daily Times*, Reading, Pa., May 3, 1895.

"This is a gratifying exception to the average publication on this subject which, as a rule, falls flat in common place or dissolves in sentimental illusion." *The New York Independent*, May 30, 1895.

"Whatever one looks for at the inconceivably distant end of the world, . . . it is of great consequence to hold to the cardinal point of this book—that life in the spiritual body immediately succeeds when life in the animal body ends. Still more important is it to distinguish Biblically, as Dr. Gerhard agrees with Dr. Whiton in doing, between 'the resurrection of the dead'—the just and unjust alike—and 'the resurrection from the dead,' the prize of 'patient continuance in well-doing,' and the life of moral health and glory, which is for the just alone. Readers of our Notes and Queries will recognize much agreement between our views and those of this book." *The Outlook* (formerly *Christian Union*), July 31, 1895.

"I have not yet had time to read your book with care, but one does not have to look far into it to see what the main argument is. In that I think I agree with you altogether." Dr. S. D. McConnell, Rector of St. Stephen's Episcopal Church, Philadelphia, in a letter to the author, Nov. 5, 1895.

"I have not yet had time to read the whole of your book, but I have spent some hours over it, and with deep interest. I have also made some use of it in my services. So far as I have read I find myself in substantial sympathy with your leading views." Theodore T. Munger, in a letter to the author, May 15, 1895.

"I have to thank you for a copy of your interesting book, at which I have glanced already and which I shall read before long carefully. From what I have seen it awakens much interest in me. It seems to be a very careful and thorough piece of work on a subject which is certainly awakening great interest at present." R. Heber Newton, D.D., in a letter to the author, Nov. 16, 1895.

"Many thanks for 'Death and the Resurrection,' which I have read with much interest and profit." John Fiske, in a letter to the author, Nov. 21, 1895.

Reading, Pa.

VIII.

NOTICES OF NEW BOOKS.

A CRITICAL AND EXEGETICAL COMMENTARY ON DEUTERONOMY. By Rev. S. R. Driver, D.D., Regius Professor of Hebrew, and Canon of Christ Church, Oxford. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1895. Crown 8vo. Price, \$3 00, *net*.

CRITICAL AND EXEGETICAL COMMENTARY ON JUDGES. By George Foot Moore, D.D., Professor of Hebrew in Andover Theological Seminary. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1895. Crown 8vo. Price, \$3.00, *net*.

A CRITICAL AND EXEGETICAL COMMENTARY ON THE EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS. By Rev. William Sanday, D.D., LL.D., Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity and Canon of Christ Church, Oxford; and Rev. A. C. Headlam, M.A., Fellow of All Souls' College, Oxford. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1895. Crown 8vo. Price, \$3.00, *net*.

These three volumes are the first volumes of THE INTERNATIONAL CRITICAL COMMENTARY on the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, edited by Professors Briggs, Driver and Plummer, and published by Messrs. T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh, and Charles Scribner's Sons, New York.

The purpose of this new work is to give to the English student of the Scriptures a critical and comprehensive commentary that will be abreast of modern Biblical scholarship, and in a measure lead its van. It will be prepared by leading American and British divines and scholars of all denominations. It will therefore be international and interconfessional in character, and will be free from polemical and ecclesiastical bias. Designed especially for students and clergymen, it will be written in a compact style, and the different volumes will be based upon a thorough critical study of the original texts of the Bible, and upon critical methods of interpretation. Each book will be preceded by an introduction, stating the results of criticism upon it, and discussing impartially the questions still remaining. The history of interpretation of the different books of Scripture will be dealt with, when necessary, in the introductions to them, and critical notices of the most important literature of the subject will be given. Historical and archaeological questions and questions of Biblical theology will also be considered, but not practical or homiletical exegesis.

The volumes whose titles are given above are all that as yet have been published of this commentary. These, however, without exception, are works of very superior merit. They are fully abreast

of the times in point of Biblical scholarship, and they give just such information as is necessary to the proper understanding of the contents of the books to which they relate, as well as of the critical questions pertaining to them. Very competent authorities have, indeed, pronounced each of these volumes the very best commentary in the English language on the portion of Scripture of which it treats, and this is no doubt a correct judgment so far as the wants of scholars are concerned. We would, therefore, heartily commend these volumes to all who are interested in the thorough study of the Scriptures, although we are not prepared to endorse all the views expressed and maintained in any of them. They are works which ministers who would be well informed and up to the times cannot well do without.

STUDIES IN THEOLOGY.—IV. CREATION: God in Time and Space. By Randolph S. Foster, D. D., LL. D., A Bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church. New York: Hunt & Eaton. Cincinnati: Cranston & Curtis. 1895. Price, \$3.00.

These studies in theology relating to creation are highly interesting and instructive. The subjects of them are: To find the Method of the Eternal Cause, Space Measures of the Universe, The Inorganic Universe, Masses of Matter—Worlds, the Solar System, Vastness of the Solar Group, Economics of the Inorganic Universe, Mode of Making the Solar System, Beyond the Solar System, Time Measures of the Universe, Dawn of the Life System, The Organic Universe, Of Man, All Human Beings from One Pair, and Are Other Worlds Inhabited? The discussion of these subjects is very scholarly and masterly. Its object is "to show the vastness of creation in its space and time measures, and its method of advance from the incipient material atom to the topmost result of spiritual existence, from chaos to cosmos, from the inorganic to the organic, and from the organic to the superorganic, and from the superorganic, or merely sentient, to the higher superorganic or spiritual realm." Many important and striking facts are presented throughout the volume which can scarcely fail to awaken in the mind of the reader increased reverence for the great Creator of all things. The book, moreover, will supply ministers with the richest illustrations of the great themes which they are called to elucidate and unfold, and will impart zest and variety to their ministrations, as well as broaden their view of the Divine method and operations. The author's views are always sound and rational, and these studies are in every respect worthy a place in every minister's library. It would be indeed well if the work were widely circulated among ministers and read by them, for it is a striking commentary on the words of the Psalmist: "The heavens declare the glory of God, and the firmament sheweth his handiwork."

THE NEW LIFE IN CHRIST. A Study in Personal Religion. By Joseph Agar Beet, D.D. New York: Hunt & Eaton. Cincinnati: Cranston & Curtis. Price, \$1.50.

This volume is the sequel to an earlier one entitled, *Through Christ to God*, which was noticed in this REVIEW a year or so ago. In the earlier volume the author "set forth the historical basis of the Christian faith and hope." In the present volume, he goes on "[to delineate the goodly structure which rests securely on that firm foundation." This goodly structure, or New Life in Christ, the author endeavors "to investigate according to the principles of scientific research." This investigation is divided into five parts, which treat respectively of The Ruin, The Restoration, The Way of Holiness, The Divine and Human in the Christian Life, and The Revelation of God in the New Life in Christ. The results attained are sound and assuring. The work is a very able one, and will amply repay careful study. The author proposes to follow it with still another volume on *The Church of Christ*. In the present volume, he says of baptism and the Lord's Supper, that they are "imperative on all the servants of Christ; and if so, they must be channels through which the Spirit of God conveys supernatural good to man."

CHRISTIANITY IN THE UNITED STATES—FROM THE FIRST SETTLEMENT DOWN TO THE PRESENT TIME. By Daniel Dorchester, D.D. Revised Edition. Hunt & Eaton, New York. Cranston & Curtis, Cincinnati. \$3.50

This is a stately and beautiful volume of over 800 pages, done in the best style of the printer's and binder's art. Its character and purpose are indicated by the title. It is not exactly a history of the *Christian Church* in the United States, but of *Christianity*. It grew out of certain correspondence the author held with Rev. Robert Baird, D.D., now deceased, the eminent historian of *Religion in America*. Its aim is to trace the influence of the Christian religion upon the life of communities and the nation. This involved, of course, the statistics, and to some extent the history, of the various Christian denominations, but it has opened up greater room for the author's study and statement of the influence these denominations exert upon the social life of the nation. The competing forces of religion upon the nation, the author has included under three heads: Protestantism, Romanism, and a variety of divergent elements. These are traced historically in the different stages of the national life, from the beginning in the colonial times down to the present time. The work contains a number of maps and tables of statistics. It includes a larger expression of the author's opinion and judgment upon the forces he traces than in a mere history, and the reader may find occasion here and there to dissent from such judgment, but on the whole it will be found helpful to the reader. The influence of the skeptical philosophy of England and France

upon the nation's early life is brought out more fully than is the case in the mere history of religious denominations. We commend the volume as a valuable, as well as ornamental, contribution to any library.

LITERATURE OF THEOLOGY: A CLASSIFIED BIBLIOGRAPHY OF THEOLOGICAL AND GENERAL RELIGIOUS LITERATURE. By John Fletcher Hurst. New York: Hunt & Eaton. Cincinnati: Cranston & Curtis. 1896. \$4.00.

This is a volume not so much for the general reader, or for general reading, but rather for students and scholars, and that in a special department. It contains 757 pages of titles of books, and an appendix of 139 pages of the names of authors and subjects. The author says very pertinently in the close of his preface: "The author of the *Literature of Theology* dares not flatter himself that he can persuade many possessors of poor collections of books to reform them; but if he can lead some of those who are forming their libraries, who are looking into the future for the possession of treasures in books, to select well, to buy only the best, and to make a wise search for special information in general libraries, the disappointments and agonies of at least one friend of books, and friend of all who find friends in books, will not have been in vain."

After an introduction, containing Propædæutics, Bibliography, Dictionaries, Cartography, and Collected Works, there are the following general divisions:

I. Exegetical Theology, including critical apparatus, commentaries, special subjects; II. Historical Theology, with sub-divisions; III. Systematic Theology; and IV. Practical Theology.

We recommend this volume to all who are interested in the study of theology, and especially to theological students who are just beginning to form their libraries. One feature of the notices is that the price is always given, thus saving the necessity often of correspondence to find it out. This book, like a good dictionary, should be at hand for reference in every minister's library.

THE PROPHETS OF ISRAEL. *Popular Sketches from Old Testament History.* By Carl Heinrich Cornill, Doctor of Theology and Professor of Old Testament History in the University of Königsberg. Translated by Sutton F. Corkran. The Open Court Publishing Company, Chicago. 1896. Pages, viii and 194. Price, Cloth, \$1.00.

Prof. Cornill is well known in England and America, as well as in Germany, as an authority in regard to matters connected with Old Testament Science. The volume before us, though the matter of which it consists was first delivered in the form of popular lectures, bears marks of thorough critical scholarship, of honest and fearless devotion to truth, and of sincere Christian faith. Prof. Cornill is an orthodox Christian, no less than a scientific critic and

theologian. Of course he treats the history of the prophets and of the religion of Israel from the standpoint of the organic view which has become the reigning view among German as well as English theologians. This view applies to the history of Israel the idea of organic development and progress, which must be applied to the history of other nations, but does not for that reason refuse to see in the history of Israel a higher element and life than those which are found elsewhere. Israel is a peculiar people, and its history is a peculiar history; but it is *history*, and not merely mechanical movement, and has, therefore, real moral and religious value. The fourteen or fifteen hundred years of Israel's history present not merely a dead level of religious and moral ideas and sentiments, but a progressive evolution. The degree of religious development in the time of Moses, for instance, was not at all what it was in the time of the prophets. This truth underlies the book before us, and is presented with clearness and force. Those who wish to know the tendency of the *Higher Criticism*, in its devout as well as most scientific form, will do well to read this little volume.

In order to give the reader an idea of the author's style and of the open candor with which he states his convictions, we quote a few sentences. "In the sense in which the historian speaks of 'knowing,'" he says, "we know absolutely nothing about Moses. All original records are missing; we have not received a line, not even a word, from Moses himself, or from any of his contemporaries; even the celebrated Ten Commandments are not from him, but, as can be proved, were written in the first half of the seventh century, between 700 and 650 B.C." But while he thus denies to Moses the composition of the Pentateuch, our author nevertheless assumes that Moses was an historical character, whose work, though not absolutely new for Israel, was yet the real foundation of *Jahvehism*, or of the religion of Israel, upon which the prophets afterwards builded further. The word *Jahveh*, about whose origin and meaning there has been so much dispute, the author derives from an Arabic root which means to "cause to fall," to "fell;" *Jahveh* is the *feller*, the God who overthrows His enemies by means of His thunderbolts. Of course it came to mean much more in later times.

It remains only to add that the book is provided with a copious *index*, which adds greatly to its value, making it convenient as a book of reference; and that the translation is done in a most admirable manner. Indeed, if it were not so stated, one would not suppose it to be a translation at all, but a work originally composed in English. This is the advantage of having for translator one who not only understands the language from which and that into which he is translating, but also the *thought* which he is interpreting.

W. R.

PRIMER OF PHILOSOPHY. By Dr. Paul Carus. The Open Court Publishing Company, Chicago. 1895. Pages 238. Price, paper cover, 25 cents.

This work belongs to the "Religion of Science Library," now being issued serially by the *Open Court Publishing Company*. The volumes of this series are issued bimonthly, and the annual subscription price is \$1.50. This makes scientific literature of a high order as cheap as fiction, and brings it within the reach of readers in the most limited financial circumstances.

The volume before us, though called a *Primer*, is not by any means a work for mere beginners in philosophy. It is a work, in fact, which, though it might be used as a text-book for beginners in colleges, requires on the part of the reader some considerable power of abstract thinking, and can be studied with profit by persons who are no longer beginners in the domain of thought to which it belongs. It is written in a plain and direct style. The language is clear and perspicuous. The technical terms used, and which could not be avoided in a work on philosophy, are carefully explained, and the signification adopted is adhered to. Such terms, for example, as "subjective" and "objective," "a priori" and "a posteriori," "deductive" and "inductive," "experience," "knowledge," "science," etc., are analyzed with clearness and precision, so that an intelligent reader need have no particular difficulty in finding his way through the labyrinths of metaphysics. The author is familiar with German philosophy; and his knowledge of German philosophical terminology has been of much value to him, enabling him to reach clear definitions in English.

The author's philosophical principle may be expressed in the terms *positive monism*. But neither of these terms is taken in the sense in which they have usually been understood. Positivism here does not stand for sensationalism or materialism, but for the idea that all our knowledge rests upon objective data or facts. The thinking mind does not create its objects, but finds them given in an objective intelligible world. So the term monism is not used in the sense of "one substance," but in the sense that the universe is an organic whole, and that all the different truths contained in it are but so many aspects of one and the same truth. The reality underlying the phenomenal universe, both in its subjective and objective aspects, is defined as "a system of interactions," or "as a process of causation." This definition, which seems to be essentially the same as that of Lotze, does away with the notion of matter as of an inert something absolutely different from spirit. The ultimate constitution of the universe is dynamic, and we are rid of the idea of a dark, impenetrable *hyle*, which, according to the older philosophies, formed an eternal counterpart to the Deity.

Of the value of the philosophy presented in the volume under notice we now express no opinion. We do express our sympathy,

however, with the author's view of the *test* of philosophy. "The truth of a philosophy," he says, "is verified in its ethics. The best argument in favor of a philosophy is this, that people can live according to the maxims derived therefrom." That we believe; and we believe, by the way, that the same test is applicable also to theology. Indeed, theology and philosophy have much in common; and the one will always condition the other. As is our philosophy, so usually will be our theology too; and the study of a system of philosophy so profound as that here under consideration, cannot but have a quickening effect upon theology.

This book also, like the preceding one, has a complete index, which greatly enhances its value to the student. W. R.

AN INTRODUCTION TO DOGMATIC THEOLOGY, Based on Luthardt, by Reverend Franklin Weidner, D.D., LL.D., Professor of Theology in the Chicago Lutheran Theological Seminary. Second Edition Revised. Fleming H. Revell Company, Publishers, New York, Chicago and Toronto. Pages 287.

This work is not a system of dogmatic theology, but only an introduction, or prolegomenon, to such a system. It treats, with considerable detail, of the *definition*, the *contents*, the *method* and the *history* of dogmatics. Nor is it strictly an original work. It is said on the title page to be based on Luthardt, and it is, besides, as is natural in such a work, a good deal of a compilation. That the work, while not in the ordinary sense a translation, is yet, in many of its parts, at least, a pretty close reproduction of the German original, we think, is apparent from its language and style. We find, for instance, 'theology defined as "the churchly science of Christianity," and Christianity, as "the personal fellowship of salvation on the part of man with God, in the Holy Ghost, through Jesus Christ." It is only after translating such definitions back into German that one is able fully to comprehend their meaning. An ordinary English reader, we imagine, would be considerably puzzled if he were asked to give the meaning of the phrase "churchly science of Christianity." But such defects may be overlooked in a work of this kind, which is not designed for ordinary readers, but for ministers and students of theology.

Prof. Weidner defines dogmatics as "the science which presents in their connection and mutual relations, the doctrines or dogmas which it is its aim to reproduce from the religious faith of the Christian himself in harmony with the Scriptures and the teaching of the Church." Dogmas are the doctrines of faith involved in the Christian consciousness of the Church at any particular time; and dogmatics is the scientific or systematic presentation of these dogmas. Dogmatic theology is thus differentiated from Biblical theology, on the one hand, and from speculative theology on the other. Dogmatic theology, accordingly, becomes heterodox when it departs

from the established doctrines of a church. For progress in theology we must, therefore, look to Biblical and to speculative or philosophical theology rather than to dogmatics. This, if we understand him correctly, is Professor Weidner's view, and in this we believe that he is correct.

Of course, Professor Weidner is a Lutheran, and believes thoroughly in Lutheran theology. For this certainly no one will blame him. But we who are not Lutheran can not always agree with him. We refer to but a single point. Speaking of Zwingli as a Reformed dogmatician, he says that, "Acknowledging as his formal principle the exclusive authority of Scripture as a Rule of Faith, he often did violence to the word of God, for he approached it externally, and explained the Scriptures according to his subjective judgment. He regarded the sacraments as only commemorative signs, and he had such superficial views of original sin and guilt that he regarded even heathen, like Socrates and Cato, without further qualification, as members of the kingdom of God." To all of which we simply reply that we differ with the learned author. We are free to say, for instance, that, on the subject of original sin, we greatly prefer Zwingli's view to that of Luther, which supposes man in his present condition to be as devoid of moral power as a stock or a stone (*similis trunco et lapidi*). But this difference of opinion in regard to particular doctrines does not prevent us from seeing in the volume before us an important contribution to theological science, which we can recommend especially to such as are interested in the history of dogmatics. W. R.

THE CHRIST DREAM, by Louis Albert Banks, D.D., author of "The People's Christ," "White Slave," "The Revival Quiver," "Common Folks' Religion," etc. New York: Hunt & Eaton; Cincinnati: Cranston & Curtis. Pages 275. Price, \$1.20.

This is a volume of sermons on such themes as "The Dream of Christian Civilization," "Angelic Models for Earthly Lives," "The Treasures of the Highlands," "The Inspiration of the Hope of Immortality," "The Vital Atmosphere of a Christian Life," etc. The number of discourses contained in the volume is twenty-four. We presume that the title of the selection was suggested by the theme of the first sermon, in which the thought is developed that the hope or dream of a universal triumph of Christianity in this world, is destined to become a reality—is, in fact, being realized now. The world, though still sinful enough, is yet growing better, and Christianity is gradually taking possession of its entire life. The same spirit of hopeful optimism, or perhaps, rather, *meliorism*, seems to run through the other sermons embraced in the collection.

The language is simple and chaste, and is adapted to the intelligence of ordinary Christian congregations. The structure of the sermons is unconventional and natural. While the thought pro-

ceeds according to correct logical sequence, there is no exhibition of skeletons and no parade of logical formulas. In this respect these discourses are in harmony with the prevailing fashion of sermonizing in our day. Young preachers who desire a *model* of popular sermons for study would do well to procure this volume. It would be profitable reading also for Christian households. W. R.

MEMORIAL SERVICES IN HONOR OF PETER MINUIT, First Governor of New Netherlands, 1626-1632, and of New Sweden, 1638, held Tuesday, April 23, 1895, in the Court House, Dover, Delaware, under the Auspices of the General Assembly. Edited by Chaplain Cort of the Senate and Chaplain Murray, of the House, at Dover, Del., May, 1895. Delawarean Power Print, Dover, Delaware, 1895. Pages 43.

The contents of this publication are fully described in the title page. The principal feature of the pamphlet is the Historical Address by Rev. Cyrus Cort, D.D., in which, with becoming piety and patriotism, there is rescued from oblivion one of the important characters in the early history of America, Peter Minuit, the first Governor of New Netherlands, who was a Dutchman, and a member of the Reformed Church of Holland. Dr. Cort deserves the thanks of his countrymen for the services which he has rendered them in this work. It is a part of piety to keep in affectionate remembrance the fathers who were before us. W. R.

POVERTY'S FACTORY, by Rev. Stanley L. Krebs, M.A. Arena Publishing Company, Boston.

This little volume is striking in style and contents, and is well worth careful reading. The author paints in a strong light the social and economical evils which prevail in modern civilization, and finds the primary cause of them in the inequitable distribution of wealth that is in the abnormal accumulation of riches in the hands of a few at the expense and to the detriment of the many. The facts in the case, the existing social conditions, poverty, vice and crime, are set forth with a great deal of skill and in vigorous language. The unfair advantage taken by the few who are in a position to control legislation and manipulate production and trade for their own aggrandizement, and the impotent and ineffective remedies which have been proposed as means of relief are discussed without fear or favor; and finally a way of escape is pointed out through the quickening of the public conscience and the legitimate activity of the Christian Church so as to secure "comprehensive representation"—that is, the representation of every association, profession or station in our legislative bodies, and the consequent enactment of just and equitable laws for the government of rich and poor alike.

The author does not object to the holding of private property, nor does he advocate State socialism; but he insists that the State must

set bounds to the greed and rapacity of men, and that the individual must be taught to recognize his obligation towards others and his responsibility for their condition at the same time that he is concerned for his own development in means and personality. This, we think, is the "hard knot" of the social and economic problem, and the author is undoubtedly right in looking to the principles of our holy religion as the only means at hand for the salvation of modern society.

To secure the proper adjustment of the various economic and social relations between men, more is required than a disposition on the part of particular individuals to make a profession of faith in Christianity and to take an active part in Christian work. The fact that one of the wealthiest men in the United States is an earnest Christian who conducts family worship at home and is the superintendent of a Sunday-school, does not make it safe to leave in his hands the power to tax at his will almost every family in the land by raising the price of a commodity which in one form or another is a prime necessity everywhere. It is easy to be kind and generous, and to give millions for the endowment of universities if you have the power to squeeze out of the scanty earnings of the poorest more than enough to reimburse you. And every one, no doubt, would rather see such power in the hands of a humane, generous Christian man, than in the hands of a hard, selfish villain. But the fact is, such power ought not to be in the hands of *any one*. Manifestly it is incumbent upon society to advance a step so as to make such a condition of things impossible.

It may, however, be fairly questioned whether, in the author's indictment "abnormal wealth" is not charged with the authorship of more evil in the form of poverty and crime than should be properly laid at its door. Selfishness and rapacity, intemperance and vice, abound in all ranks and conditions of men. The hardest taskmasters and the greatest oppressors are by no means always the inordinately rich; and it seems to us that the present stage of industrial development, the organization of large establishments with the consequent separation between employers and employees, the degradation of the latter into things or machines to the exclusion of a personal interest in them by the former, and the utter helplessness and recklessness of those who, whether or not by their own fault or forced into the lowest stratum of the social structure, are responsible for much of the poverty and misery which we daily witness. Again, it is a question whether the remedy proposed, "comprehensive representation," is adequate.

The representatives which labor and granger movements have up to this time brought forward have hardly come up to the expectations of their friends and constituents. Here, too, it will be necessary to take a step in advance by means of better education and the inculcation of a higher type of morality or Christian principle.

While, therefore, this book has by no means spoken the last word on the topics which it discusses, it may be regarded as an able and valuable contribution to the literature of the subject, as bright, strong and suggestive, and as an index pointing in a direction in which economic thought is likely to develop very rapidly in the near future.

J. S. S.

A MANUAL OF ETHICS. Designed for the Use of Students. By John S. Mackenzie, M.A., Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge; Examiner in Mental Philosophy in the University of Aberdeen. Second Edition. W. B. Clive, Publisher, 65 Fifth Avenue, New York. Pages, xxx and 355. Price, \$1.50.

This volume belongs to the "University Tutorial Series," consisting of text-books for the use of students in colleges and universities. The author is already known to philosophical students by means of his profound work entitled "An Introduction to Social Philosophy," which appeared a few years ago. In this Manual of Ethics his reputation for deep thinking and clear writing is well sustained. The work "is intended primarily," we are told, "for the use of private students, and especially for those who are preparing for such examinations in Ethics as those conducted by the University of London." It is, however, well adapted also for use as a text-book in higher institutions of learning, and has accordingly been adopted as such in Yale, Columbian University, Washington, Brown University, University of Kansas, Ohio State University, Iowa College, De Pauw University, Iowa Wesleyan University, and other leading institutions. This fact may be regarded as sufficient evidence of the general merit of the work, especially when we remember that the first edition was only published a little over two years ago.

Some idea of the scope of the work may be obtained from the following table of contents: PART I. THE THEORY OF MORALS—*The Scope of Ethics—The Relation of Ethics to other Sciences—The Moral Judgment—Duty—Will and Desire—Happiness—Perfection—The Freedom of the Will—The Individual and Society.* PART II. THE MORAL LIFE.—*Moral Order—The Commandments—The Virtues—The Inner Life—Moral Pathology—Moral Progress—The Relation of Art to Ethics—The Relation of Ethics to Religion.*

The general ethical point of view adopted in this manual is that of the school of idealism, or intuitionism, that is, the school founded by Kant, and developed by Hegel in Germany, and by Green and others in England. But the author, whose reading has evidently covered the whole field of ethical thought from Plato and Aristotle downwards, has manifestly learned something also from the school of evolution. While he does not regard the moral life as the product of a blind, spontaneous process of materialistic development, he does nevertheless regard it as a process of development, not merely in the individual, but in the organism of humanity

as a whole. This is implied in the notion of Ethics as the science of conduct with reference to an absolute or supreme end, the highest good. The highest good cannot be realized by any individual for itself, apart from all connection with other individuals. Humanity is an organism of individuals, and it is only through this that the highest moral end or good can be realized. Morality, therefore, must be social. There can be no perfect moral development of the individual without a similar development of society. The perfection of individual moral character would only be possible in the midst of a perfect moral environment. This is an important hint for the moralist, especially for the moral reformer. Again, morality is progressive. The moral ideal is only realized progressively, in connection with the general progress of society. But this does not imply such a relation of the individual to society as would deprive the former of its freedom of will. Our author, though he believes in moral progress, and in the influence of moral environment, is yet a libertarian. He believes in the freedom of the will. He holds, however, that the will which is free is not the will as given in creation, but the will as moralized. "We ought not to say," he remarks, page 147, "that we are free, but rather that we are *developing towards freedom*. We shall be perfectly free only when we are perfectly rational; and that will be—when?"

We should like to refer to some other points in the author's treatment of his theme; as, for instance, his views of the relation of art to ethics, and of the relation of ethics to religion. But we must stop. To those of our readers who are interested in ethical studies, and there ought to be many, we commend this volume. We would only add that the volume is not encumbered with those heavy metaphysical discussions which are generally found to make a part of larger treatises on the subject of ethics, and is, therefore, within the capacity of readers of ordinary intelligence. W. R.

GOD'S WORD THROUGH PREACHING. The Lyman Beecher Lectures before the Theological Department of Yale College. Fourth Series. By John Hall, D.D., LL.D. A. S. Barnes & Co., Publishers, New York. 1895. Pages 274. Price, \$1.25.

The lectures contained in this volume were delivered twenty years ago. The fact that, after such a lapse of time, there is a sufficient demand to justify a republication of them in the form of a new edition, would seem to be a high testimony to their value; especially at a time when books on the general subject of preaching are as numerous as they are at the present moment. Of course any literary work coming from Dr. Hall might be expected to possess a high degree of merit.

These lectures do not form a treatise on homiletics in the ordinary sense. Their scope is much wider than that. While the lecturer discusses, of course, some of the topics especially treated in homi-

letics, such as the relative advantages of expository, textual, and topical preaching, he considers the function of the preacher always in its relation to the office and work of the ministry as a whole. The ministry, according to Dr. Hall, is an office of the Church, and this fact determines its nature and character.

Dr. Hall maintains that it is the preacher's ordinary business to preach the gospel. It is not the preacher's calling to discuss questions of science, or criticism, or politics. Politics does not, as a rule, belong to the pulpit. And yet, as Dr. Hall says, "Crises may arise when fidelity to Christ demands political teaching from ministers." This we believe to be a correct position.

What Dr. Hall says, in these lectures, of the necessity of the preacher's putting himself into sympathetic relations with his congregation by means of faithful and patient pastoral work among the members of his flock, should receive earnest consideration from every pastor. There is usually a gulf between the minister and his audience, fixed by the difference of their training and pursuits, which must be bridged over before the minister's services can be of much account. "Is it not one of the reasons that account for the mass of men who do no good to church," asks Dr. Hall, "that *they have no feeling that the talking will be on the plane of their lives?*"

To the younger brethren in the ministry especially we commend these lectures as affording very valuable directions for the conduct of their activity. We are sure that if such a volume had fallen into our hands when we were young, it would have been of immense account to us. Success in the ministry, we are coming to be more and more convinced, depends very largely upon the minister's fidelity and tact; and in these regards he may be much helped by the study of a volume like that now under notice.

W. R.